THE MATTHAEAN INFANCY STORIES

Their Form, Structure, and Relation to the Theology of the First Evangelist

by

Walter Barnes Tatum, Jr.

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: June 29, 1966

Approved:

Hugh Anderson
Professor Hugh Anderson, Advisor

Kenneth W. Clark

Orval Wintermute

James L. Price

Frederick Herzog

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1966

Tr. R.
Ph.D.
T221M
1966

TO MY WIFE

ABSTRACT

(Religion)

THE MATTHAEAN INFANCY STORIES

Their Form, Structure, and Relation to the Theology

of the First Evangelist

by

Walter Barnes Tatum, Jr.

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: June 29, 1966

Approved:

Hugh Anderson
Professor Hugh Anderson, Advisor

Kenneth W. Clark

Orval Wintermute

James L. Price

Frederick Herzog

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1966

ABSTRACT

With the contemporary application of the redaktionsgeschichtlich method to the Synoptic Gospels, it has been increasingly stressed that the Evangelists are not only collectors of the tradition of Jesus' words and deeds but are also interpreters of that tradition.

Essentially a redaktionsgeschichtlich study of Matthew i-ii, this dissertation attempts to elucidate the First Evangelist's theological interest in the traditions of Jesus' infancy. In order to accomplish this purpose, the dissertation is divided into three chapters.

Chapter I focuses upon the highly controversial question of the literary origins of Matthew i-ii. A form- and source-critical study of these chapters, it strives to discern the role played by the First Evangelist in their composition. His main contribution is the highly schematic structure of Matthew i-ii. The genealogy (i.1-17) is followed by five narrative scenes which either enclose (i.18-25; ii.1-12) or conclude with (ii.13-15, 16-18, 19-23) an introductory formula and OT citation. The chief division falls between the two chapters (between i.1-17, 18-25 and ii.1-12, 13-15, 16-18, 19-23). It is just this literary structure that discloses the First Evangelist's theological concern for these traditions.

Guided by the conclusions reached in the literary analysis, Chapter II explicates the theological significance of Matthew i-ii for the First Evangelist. The Evangelist is pre-eminently concerned with the messianic origins

of Jesus. He strives to demonstrate not only that with his origins Jesus possesses messianic credentials but that his origins establish him as the Messiah. With chapter one, the Evangelist explicates Jesus' genealogical origins. The personal names "the Son of Abraham" (vs.1) "the Son of David" (vs.1) and "Emmanuel" or "God with us" (vs.23) epitomize this interest. With chapter two, the Evangelist sets forth Jesus' geographical origins. The place names "Bethlehem" (vss.1, 5, 6, 8), "Egypt" (vss.13, 14, 15), "Bethlehem" or "Ramah" (vss.16, 18), and "Nazareth" (vs.23) epitomize this concern. In these chapters, therefore, the First Evangelist answers the questions: From whom? and From where? Insofar as these questions have been forced upon him by the tradition, his answers are primarily dogmatic and only secondarily apologetic.

Chapter III turns to a consideration of the relation of Matthew i-ii to the entire Gospel and thus the import of this relationship for the First Evangelist. Opposite the infancy account of Matthew i-ii, the final scene of Matthew xxviii.16-20 forms the outer molding of the framework within which the First Evangelist re-presents his Marcan source. Having underlined Jesus' earthly authority in the body of the Gospel (as Mt.vii.29, compare Mk.i.22; Mt.ix.6, 8, compare Mk.ii.10; etc.), the Evangelist now elevates the theme of Jesus' exalted authority to a prominent position (Mt.xxviii.18b). By beginning his Gospel with the infancy traditions, the Evangelist roots Jesus' authority in his origins. Jesus' origins, therefore, constitute the basis of his authority. So it is a straightforward christological motive that prompts the Evangelist to preface his redaction of St. Mark with the infancy traditions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons provided the stimulus and guidance for this dissertation. It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to them.

Professor Hugh Anderson directed and reviewed my work with thoroughness and care. The frequent consultations with him were not only profitable but enjoyable. From these meetings I gained the encouragement to see the task through to its completion. Yet the shortcomings of the finished text are mine.

Thanks are also due to Professors Kenneth Clark, Frederick Herzog, James Price, and John Strugnell. They read my prospectus and portions of the rough manuscript and offered valuable criticisms and helpful suggestions.

I also appreciate Professor Orval Wintermute's willingness to serve on my doctoral committee in the absence of Professor Strugnell.

Both Professor Clark and Professor Robert E. Cushman, Dean of the Duke Divinity School, are to be remembered for the opportunity afforded me to be associated with the International Greek New Testament Project as a Graduate Research Assistant. The experience was rewarding and the stipend generous.

For the patience and diligence of Mrs. Carl F. Sapp, who typed the dissertation, I am grateful.

And finally, any specific statement of indebtedness to Carolyn my wife would be insufficient; for what this dissertation owes to her is incalculable.

W. B. T., Jr.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

INTRODUCTION 2

I. THE LITERARY ORIGINS OF MATTHEW I-II 5

Translation and Text, 6
The Literary Structure Defined, 16
The Literary Structure Analyzed, 42
The First Evangelist and the Composition of Matthew i-ii, 90

II. MATTHEW I-II AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE FIRST EVANGELIST 94

The Individuality of Matthew i-ii, 95
Towards an Understanding of Matthew i-ii, 102
The Origins of Jesus Christ, 108

III. MATTHEW I-II, THE FIRST GOSPEL, AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE FIRST EVANGELIST 146

The Exaltation of Jesus, 149
The Earthly Ministry of Jesus, 177
Matthew i-ii and the Individuality of the First Gospel, 190

CONCLUSION 194

BIBLIOGRAPHY 198

ABBREVIATIONS

American	The Bible: An American Translation, by J. M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed
Ant.	Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews
BibZeit	Biblische Zeitschrift
BiKi	Bibel und Kirche
BiViChr	Bible et Vie Chrétienne
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CD	The Qumran Damascus Document
ChQR	Church Quarterly Review
Conf.	Philo's On the Confusion of Tongues
Eph.	Ignatius' Letter to the Ephesians
EstBib	Estudios Bíblicos
EvQ	Evangelical Quarterly
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie
h.e.	Eusebius' Church History
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
KJV	The Bible: The King James Version
Life	Josephus' Life
LXX	The Septuagint

Moffatt	*The Bible: A New Translation*, by James Moffatt
MSS.	manuscripts
MT	The Massoretic Text
NEB	The New English Bible
NT	New Testament
NT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OT	Old Testament
Phillips	*The New Testament in Modern English*, by J. B. Phillips
1QS	The Qumran *Community Rule*
Rewards	Philo's *On Rewards and Punishments*
RScRel	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses*
RSV	The Bible: The Revised Standard Version
ScE	*Sciences Ecclésiastiques*
TTod	*Theology Today*
TR	*Textus Receptus*
Wars	Josephus' *Wars of the Jews*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

THE MATTHAEAN INFANCY STORIES

Their Form, Structure, and Relation to the Theology of the First Evangelist

INTRODUCTION

Within Synoptic criticism, it has been increasingly stressed that the Evangelists are not simply collectors of the tradition of Jesus' deeds and words but rather are themselves interpreters of that tradition.[1] By selecting, arranging, and editing the received material, each Evangelist uses it to serve his own theological interests. As an exegetical method, Redaktionsgeschichte studies the way in which the Evangelist handles the tradition in order to discern his peculiar theological point of view. This contemporary application of the redaktionsgeschichtlich method to the Synoptic Gospels provides the stimulus for and serves as the context of this examination of the Matthaean infancy account.

The purpose and procedure of this study. The basic purpose of this study is the elucidation of the First Evangelist's interest in the traditions preserved in Matthew i-ii. In this regard, several questions demand an

---

1. Among the more significant works which emphasize this viewpoint are the following: Willi Marxsen, Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," n.s. 49; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956); James M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark ("Studies in Biblical Theology"; Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957); Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, translated by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960); Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, translated by Percy Scott ("New Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963)--The individual essays in this volume are as follows: Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," and "The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew"; Barth, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law"; and Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories." Also, Wolfgang Trilling, Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums (3rd ed. rev.; "Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament," 10; München: Kösel-Verlag, 1964).

answer: What is the theological significance of these traditions to the First Evangelist? Why does he begin his Gospel with them? How does he view the relationship between the infancy traditions and the remainder of the Gospel? To accomplish this purpose and to answer such questions this study is divided into three chapters. Chapter I focuses upon the literary origins of Matthew i-ii. A form- and source-critical analysis of these chapters, it attempts to uncover the role played by the First Evangelist in their composition. Guided by the conclusions of the literary analysis, Chapter II explicates the theological significance of Matthew i-ii for the First Evangelist. Chapter III concerns itself with the relation of Matthew i-ii to the rest of the Gospel and thus the theological import of this relationship for the First Evangelist.

Tradition and interpretation in the Matthaean infancy account, therefore, is the central theme of this study. This means that it is not concerned with the question of the historicity of the events therein narrated. Insofar as this study is essentially a firsthand examination of the Gospel of St. Matthew, all English quotations from the Gospel are placed in italics. All other biblical quotations are designated by the customary quotation marks.

Some basic assumptions of this study. Underlying this examination of the Matthaean infancy story are several assumptions which to varying degrees bear upon it.

Written in Greek, the Gospel of St. Matthew dates from the last quarter of the first century. Insofar as the earliest witness for the knowledge of the Gospel is Ignatius, it probably originated in Antioch or the Syrian hinterland.

The principal source behind the Gospel is the Gospel of St. Mark.

Because the Gospel is written in Greek and dependent upon the Greek

Gospel of St. Mark which owes its origin to a non-disciple, it is unlikely that its author is the disciple Matthew. The author of the Gospel of St. Matthew, therefore, is unknown. Throughout this study he is referred to as either the First Evangelist or simply the Evangelist.

In its present form the Gospel is essentially the product of the First Evangelist. It never circulated without the infancy account (Matthew i-ii) or without parts thereof.

Although the Gospel is the work of an individual, it is a "church book."[1] As a member of a particular Christian community, the First Evangelist compiled his revised and expanded version of the Gospel of St. Mark to meet the needs of that community--its worship, teaching, preaching, discipline, and apologetics!

Both the style and thought of the Gospel suggest that its author as well as most of his readers are Hellenistic Jewish Christians rather than Hellenistic Gentile Christians.

Although these factors pertaining to the entire Gospel of St. Matthew are presupposed by this study, the study itself tends to confirm their cogency.

---

1. For this expression, see Edward P. Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 43.

Chapter I

THE LITERARY ORIGINS OF MATTHEW I-II

"The question of the sources used by the evangelist in the infancy gospel and of the extent of his own redactional work is a complicated one."[1] So says Myles Bourke. Few would quarrel with his statement; and, no doubt, it is the very complexity of the question that prompts many recent theological analyses of Matthew i-ii to avoid it for the most part.[2] If one is to make an adequate assessment of the theological significance of these chapters for the First Evangelist and his Gospel, however, one must not shun the question

---

1. "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," CBQ, XXII (1960), 167.

2. Ibid., pp. 160-75. Krister Stendahl, "Quis et unde? An Analysis of Mt 1-2," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, edited by Walther Eltester (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), pp. 94-105. Helen Milton, "The Structure of the Prologue to St. Matthew's Gospel," JBL, LXXXI (1962), 175-81. Anton Vögtle, "Die Genealogie Mt, 1,2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte (I. Teil)," BibZeit, VIII (1964), 45-58, "Die Genealogie Mt, 1,2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte (II. Teil)," BibZeit, VIII (1964), 239-62, "Die Genealogie Mt, 1,2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte (Schlussteil)," BibZeit, IX (1965), 32-49. Herbert Leroy, "'Sein Name wird sein Emmanuel!' Die Kindheitsgeschichte nach Matthäus," BiKi, XIX (1964), 110-17. So although the Matthaean birth narrative has not been neglected, the question of sources has not occupied center stage. In this respect, research with regard to the Matthaean infancy story has differed from the study of the Lucan infancy account. Much of the study of the Lucan birth story has been devoted to source analysis. In fact, this issue precipitated something of a "pamphlet war." For surveys of this debate, consult the following: Robert McL. Wilson, "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narrative," Studia Evangelica, edited by Kurt Aland, et al. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," 73; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 235-53; and H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," NTS, X (1964), 202-26.

of sources and the Evangelist's use of them. It is, therefore, precisely this complicated question that the following analysis of Matthew i-ii attempts to answer.

Translation and Text

I The genealogy of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.
2 Abraham was the father of Isaac, and Isaac was the father of
Jacob, and Jacob was the father of Judah and his brothers, 3 and
Judah was the father of Perez and Zerah, whose mother was Tamar,
and Perez was the father of Hezron, and Hezron was the father of
Aram, 4 and Aram was the father of Aminadab, and Aminadab was the
father of Nahshon, and Nahshon was the father of Salmon, 5 and Salmon
was the father of Boaz, whose mother was Rahab, and Boaz was the
father of Obed, whose mother was Ruth, and Obed was the father of
Jesse, 6 and Jesse was the father of David the king.
David was the father of Solomon, whose mother was the wife of
Uriah, 7 and Solomon was the father of Rehoboam, and Rehoboam was
the father of Abijah, and Abijah was the father of Asaph, 8 and
Asaph was the father of Jehoshaphat, and Jehoshaphat was the father
of Joram, and Joram was the father of Uzziah, 9 and Uzziah was the
father of Jotham, and Jotham was the father of Ahaz, and Ahaz was
the father of Hezekiah, 10 and Hezekiah was the father of Manasseh, and
Manasseh was the father of Amos, and Amos was the father of Josiah,
11 and Josiah was the father of Jechoniah and his brothers at the time
of the deportation to Babylon.
12 After the deportation to Babylon, Jechoniah was the father
of Shealtiel, and Shealtiel was the father of Zerubbabel, 13 and
Zerubbabel was the father of Abiud, and Abiud was the father of
Eliakim, and Eliakim was the father of Azor, 14 and Azor was the
father of Zadok, and Zadok was the father of Achim, and Achim was
the father of Eliud, 15 and Eliud was the father of Eleazar, and
Eleazar was the father of Matthan, and Matthan was the father of
Jacob, 16 and Jacob was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary,
of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ.
17 So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen
generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon are four-
teen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ
are fourteen generations.

18 Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way.
After his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they
came together, she was found to be pregnant of the Holy Spirit.
19 Now Joseph her husband, being a righteous man and not willing to

expose her publicly, decided to divorce her privately. 20But as
he reflected upon this, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared to
him in a dream and said, "Joseph, Son of David, do not be afraid
to take home Mary your wife. For the one having been conceived
in her is of the Holy Spirit. 21And she will bear a son, and you
shall call his name Jesus; for he will save his people from their
sins." 22All this took place to fulfill that spoken by the Lord
through the prophet: 23"Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear
a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel"--which means "God
with us". 24Now when Joseph woke from his sleep, he did as the
Angel of the Lord commanded him; and he took home his wife. 25But
he did not have intercourse with her until she had borne a son.
And he called his name Jesus.

II Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days
of Herod the King, behold, astrologers from the East came to Jeru-
salem and said, 2"Where is he who has been born King of the Jews?
For we observed the rising of his star and have come to pay him
homage."

3When Herod the King heard this he was disturbed, and all
Jerusalem with him. 4So calling together all the chief priests
and scribes of the people, he inquired of them where the Messiah
is to be born. 5They told him, "At Bethlehem of Judea; for so it
is written by the prophet: 6'And you, O Bethlehem, in the land of
Judah, you are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for
out of you will come a ruler who will shepherd my people Israel.'"

7Then secretly summoning the astrologers, Herod ascertained
from them the time when the star had appeared; 8and sending them
to Bethlehem, he said, "Go and inquire carefully about the child.
And when you have found him, report to me, so that I too may go and
pay him homage."

9When they had heard the King, they went their way. And, behold,
the star which they had observed at its rising went before them
until it came and stopped above the place where the child was.
10And when they saw the star, they were very glad. 11Entering the
house, they saw the child with Mary his mother; and falling down
they paid him homage. They opened their treasure chests and offered
him gifts--gold and frankincense and myrrh.

12And having been warned in a dream not to go back to Herod, they
returned to their own country by another way.

13After they had departed, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared
in a dream to Joseph and said, "Rise up, take the child and his
mother and flee into Egypt; and remain there until I tell you. For
Herod is about to search for the child in order to kill him."
14Rising up, he took the child and his mother by night and withdrew
into Egypt; 15and he remained there until the death of Herod. This
was to fulfill what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, "Out
of Egypt have I called my son."

16 Then perceiving that he had been tricked by the astrologers,
Herod became very angry; and sending he killed all the children in
Bethlehem and in all its environs who were two years of age and
under, according to the time which he had ascertained from the
astrologers. 17 Then was fulfilled what was spoken through Jeremiah
the prophet: 18 "A voice was heard in Ramah, wailing and loud lamenta-
tion; Rachel weeping for her children, and she refused to be com-
forted for they were no more."

19 When Herod died, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared in
a dream to Joseph in Egypt and said, 20 "Rise up, take the child
and his mother, and go into the land of Israel; for those who seek
the life of the child are dead." 21 Rising up, he took the child
and his mother and entered the land of Israel. 22 But having heard
that Archelaus ruled over Judea in place of his father Herod, he was
afraid to go there. And having been warned in a dream, he withdrew
into the region of Galilee; 23 and he went and settled in a village
called Nazareth. This was to fulfill what was spoken through the
prophets that he shall be called a Nazarene.

Chapter I, vss.1-17. Many of the textual variants attested for the genealogy are nothing more than orthographical variants of the names listed therein. Such orthographical variants need not be considered in detail. The Greek forms of the names which the above English translation presupposes, however, are those incorporated into the second edition of the Greek New Testament text published in 1958 by The British and Foreign Bible Society.[1]

Vs.8. Before Uzziah (= τὸν Ὀζίαν) the Curetonian Syriac manuscript (hereafter Sy^c) inserts "Ahaziah, (and) Ahaziah was the father of Joash, (and) Joash was the father of Amaziah, (and) Amaziah was the father of" (= ܘܐܚܙܝܐ ܝܠܕ ܠܝܘܐܫ . ܘܝܘܐܫ ܝܠܕ ܐܡܨܝܐ . ܘܐܡܨܝܐ ܝܠܕ).
The manuscript evidence overwhelmingly calls for the omission of these words.

---

1. For a succinct list of the different spellings of these names attested not only by the major Greek NT manuscripts and the TR but also by the LXX and Josephus, see W. C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew (3rd ed.; "The International Critical Commentary"; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), pp. 7-8.

Furthermore their omission agrees with the explicit declaration of vs.17 that there are fourteen generations from David to the Babylonian Exile. Finally, the addition can be explained simply as an interpolation by a scribe who recognized the absence of certain Judean Kings from the Matthaean genealogy.[1]

Vs.11. Before Jechoniah (= τὸν Ἰεχονίαν) such manuscripts as θ, M, 33, and family 1 (hereafter f1) insert "Jehoiakim, and Jehoiakim was the father of" (= τὸν Ἰωακείμ, Ἰωακεὶμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν). As in the case of the interpolation of the names of the three kings between Joram and Uzziah, so here scribal erudition has led to the interpolation of the name of Jehoiakim. The scribe or scribes knew that Jehoiakim was the son of Josiah and the father of Jechoniah according to the OT.[2]

Vs.16. And Jacob was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ (= Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός), P^1, ℵ, B, C, W, most other uncials, most minuscules, $Sy^{pesh\ hl}$, $Cop^{sa\ bo}$. There are, however, two other principal readings: secondly, "And Jacob was the father of Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, who was the mother of Jesus who is called Christ"[3] (= Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος Μ. ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λ-νον Χριστόν), θ, f13, and the majority of Old Latin manuscripts (hereafter It, for Itala), also Sy^c;

---

1. Compare 2 Kgs.viii.25ff, 1 Chr. iii.10-17.

2. 1 Chr.iii.15-17.

3. Understanding Mary as the subject of the verb, this translation is suggested by the NEB. However, Joseph could be the subject; and the translation would read: "And Jacob was the father of Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, was the father of Jesus who is called Christ," so the RSV.

and thirdly, "(And) Jacob was the father of Joseph, (and) Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, was the father of Jesus who is called Messiah" (ܘܝܥܩܘܒ ܐܘܠܕ ܠܝܘܣܦ. ܝܘܣܦ ܕܠܗ ܐܬܝܪܫܬ ܡܪܝܡ ܒܬܘܠܬܐ ܐܘܠܕ ܝܫܘܥ ܕܡܬܩܪܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ), Sy^{s}.[1] These three readings constitute one of the most debated textual problems in the New Testament. Among the many who have brooded over these variants are F. C. Burkitt[2] and Vincent Taylor.[3] Concentrating upon the readings preserved in the two Old Syriac manuscripts (Sy^{s} ^{c}), Burkitt concludes that the third reading (of Sy^{s}) is derived from the second reading (θ, et al.) and that the reading of Sy^{c} is derived from the reading of Sy^{s}. Taylor, however, seeks the text of the First Evangelist himself. Failing to find it intact in any of the attested readings, he attempts a reconstruction of the original text.[4]

Three factors prompt the acceptance of the first reading as the probable text of the First Evangelist.

Firstly, although divided, the manuscript evidence does favor this reading.

Secondly, this reading is in keeping with the literary style and thought of the First Evangelist. That he would call Joseph τὸν ἄνδρα is apparent from vs.19. That he would suddenly use the passive form ἐγεννήθη after the consistent usage of the active form ἐγέννησεν is also understandable.

---

1. Vincent Taylor renders this Syriac verse into Greek in this way: Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ. Ἰωσὴφ [δὲ] ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα ἦν παρθένος Μαριὰμ ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν, The Text of the New Testament (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961), p. 78.

2. Evangelion da-Mepharreshe (2 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1904), II, 263-66.

3. The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1920), pp. 105-14.

4. Ibid., p. 112. Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας. Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν.

In denying the originality of this first reading, Vincent Taylor considers this passive form as its Achilles heel. Noting that ἐγέννησεν is used throughout the genealogy in the sense of legal parentage rather than physical paternity, he feels it strange that the Evangelist would discontinue this practice on the last rung of the genealogical ladder and use ἐγεννήθη of physical parentage. Yet certain objections can be made to Taylor's viewpoint. It is a moot question whether ἐγέννησεν is in fact used in the sense of legal parentage instead of physical paternity. That the legal relationship between father and son usually rests upon physical paternity is made clear by the way in which each woman other than Mary is introduced: (father) begat (son) by (= ἐκ) (mother). Furthermore, after the employment of the active form throughout the table of descent, the adoption of the passive form in vs.16b is quite appropriate; for the relationship among Joseph, Mary, and Jesus is indeed unique (see vss.18-25).

Thirdly, it is possible to explain the derivation of the two major variants from the first reading. The second reading (followed also by the third reading) introduces the relative clause ᾧ μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος for τὸν ἄνδρα. Theologically motivated, this alteration attempts to state more explicitly the virginal character of Jesus' conception and birth. This second reading also substitutes ἐγέννησεν for the clause ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη. The reason for this alteration is not quite so obvious; yet it is not inconsonant with the notion of the virginal conception and birth. Following the precedent established by the use of the active form ἐγέννησεν to join the name of the father to the name of his son, the scribe now adopts the same active form to join the name of Mary to the name of her son Jesus. Now Mary is the subject of the verb, and ἐγέννησεν means "to bear" rather than "to beget." A certain ambiguity, however, remains insofar as the Greek ἐγέννησεν can be understood as either feminine or masculine. Thus, although the scribe who

introduced the change viewed Mary as its subject, Joseph could be understood as such. It is just this confusion that the third reading (of Sy^s) avoids. The scribe accomplishes this by his repetition of the name Joseph (=ܝܘܣܦ) and by his adoption of the masculine form of the verb (=ܐܠܕ). The question as to this Syriac scribe's position relative to the virginal conception and birth is an interesting question in itself. It falls, however, outside the scope of the present study; for Bruce Metzger rightly observes that "few if any textual critics can be found today who would argue that Sy^s preserves the original form of Matthew at this verse."[1]

Barring some startling manuscript discovery, the discussion as to the original form of vs.16 will never end. That the first reading represents the text of the First Evangelist is only probability--like most historical questions. But for the purpose of this analysis of Matthew i-ii, it is better to embrace this probability than to follow Vincent Taylor out into the uncharted waters of text reconstruction guided by the three principal extant readings.

Vs.18. Birth (=γένεσις), ℵ, B, C, W, Δ, Θ, and the majority of fl. But "birth" (=γέννησις) is attested by a few uncials, f13, 28, 33, 565, and 700. Insofar as the latter word more literally means "birth," one might expect it to be used in this superscription. This is particularly true insofar as γένεσις appears in vs.1 in the heading over the genealogy with a meaning other than "birth." It was probably just this expectation that led scribes to alter the original γένεσις.

Vs.18. Jesus Christ (=Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), most uncials, most minuscules, $Cop^{sa\ bo}$, Eth, Arm, $Sy^{pesh\ hl}$. There are three other attested readings:

---

1. "On the Citation of Variant Readings of Matt 1 16," JBL, LXXVII (1958), p. 361, n. 1.

secondly, "Christ" (= Χριστοῦ), 71, $Sy^{s\ c}$, and the whole Latin tradition; thirdly, "Christ Jesus" (= Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ), B; fourthly, "Jesus" (=Ἰησοῦ), W. A rare Matthaean expression, the double name Jesus Christ appears elsewhere in the Gospel in vs. 1 and possibly xvi.21. That this reading represents the text of the First Evangelist is rendered quite likely by the strong manuscript support. Furthermore, vs.18a possesses a character similar to vs.1. Both are superscriptions. In a section constructed as carefully as chapter i, one might expect the First Evangelist to repeat this double name in a programmatic way.[1]

Vs.21. Before a son (=υἱόν), $Sy^{s\ c}$ insert "you" (= ܟ). F. C. Burkitt correctly sees this as a stylistic addition.[2]

Vs.22. Before the prophet (= τοῦ προφήτου), such manuscripts as D, it (a few MSS.), and $Sy^{s\ c}$, read "Isaiah" (=Ἡσαΐου). This addition is a further example of scholarly erudition on the part of later scribes.

Vs.23. Instead of they shall call (= καλέσουσιν), D and a few other manuscripts read "you shall call" (=καλέσεις). Insofar as LXX B of Isa.vii. 14 has the same form, this variant may reflect the influence of the LXX.

Vs.25. He did not have intercourse with her until (= οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ), most manuscripts. Sy^{s} and k omit these words. Supported by the Diatessaron, Sy^{c} reads, "he lived purely with her until" (= ܘܟܝܐ ܗܘܬ ܒܬܪܗ ܥܕ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܪܗ ܩܕܡܝܬܐ). F. C. Burkitt contends that "the agreement of the African Latin (k) with the original form of the Old Syriac (S), virtually supported as it is but not caused by the Diatessaron, carries us back to the

---

1. For a discussion of the two textual problems presented by vs.18, see W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), pp. 68-69.

2. Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, pp. 262-63. Compare Lk.i.13.

earliest stage of the canonical text." Indeed, the First Evangelist "was only concerned at this point to assert that Joseph publicly accepted Mary as his lawful wife and publicly acknowledged her son as lawfully born in wedlock. . . . But it is easy to see how later generations of Christians, more impressed with the significance of the physical miracle and less anxious to assure the legality of our Lord's title to be Heir of David, might find difficulties in the shorter text."[1] Burkitt may be right. As will be seen later, the First Evangelist does appear to be primarily interested in the virginal conception rather than the virginal birth. Yet the longer reading supported by the overwhelming majority of manuscripts is here adopted. Firstly, this reading does claim the strongest manuscript support; and, secondly, the First Evangelist himself seems very much "impressed with the significance of the physical miracle."

Vs.25. Before a son (=υἱόν), the scribe of Sy^s inserts "him" (= ܗܘ) in accordance with his stylistic practice.[2]

Vs.25. A son (=υἱόν), ℵ, B, 1, 33, b, c, and g^1. Two different variants are attested: secondly, "her first-born son" (=τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον), C, D*, W, , most minuscules, it (a few MSS.), Vg, $Sy^{pesh\ hl}$; and thirdly, "the first-born son" (=τὸν υἱὸν τὸν πρωτότοκον), D^c, L, d, g, Eth. Both of these longer readings probably stem from the influence of Lk.ii.7.

Chapter II, vs.6. Instead of in the land of Judah (=γῇ Ἰούδα), D and it read "of Judea" (=τῆς Ἰουδαίας). This is clearly an assimilation to the preceding verse wherein τῆς Ἰουδαίας is mentioned.

---

1. Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, p. 261.
2. See the brief note on vs.21.

Vs.6. Out of you (=ἐκ σοῦ), most uncials, most minuscules. But "out of whom" (=ἐξ οὗ) is attested by ℵ, C, D (=ἐκ οὗ) and a few minuscules. In spite of rather strong support for the latter, the former is accepted. Thus the you (=σοῦ) parallels the you (=σὺ) with which the quotation begins. The variant reading is understandable because of the phonetic similarity between the two constructions. A similar confusion has occurred at this point in the LXX text of Micah: LXX A, ἐκ σοῦ (= MT מִמְּךָ); and LXX B, ἐξ οὗ.

Vs.9. The place where the child was (=οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον), most manuscripts. But D and it (several MSS.) have simply "the child" (=τοῦ παιδίου). The latter reading probably represents an alteration of the text prompted by stylistic or literary concerns. Yet perhaps there is involved something of a christological motive—having the star stop over the child rather than the place where he was.

Vs.16. Two years of age and under (=διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω), most manuscripts. Although not affecting the translation or meaning, D reads διετίας καὶ κάτω.

Vs.17. Before through Jeremiah (=διὰ Ἱερεμίου), D and a few other manuscripts add "by the Lord" (=ὑπὸ Κυρίου). This interpolation arises from the attempt to bring the wording of this particular introductory formula into accord with the wording of such formulas as those in i.22 and ii.15.

Vs.18. Before wailing (=κλαυθμὸς), "mourning and" (=θρῆνος καὶ) is inserted by a large number of manuscripts, so C, D, L, W, Δ, f13, 28, 33, Sy^{sc}, Arm, Geo. For the Greek manuscripts, this addition can be explained as assimilation to the LXX text of Jeremiah (following the MT). Similarly, for the Syriac manuscripts, this addition can be explained as assimilation to the OT Peshitta text of Jeremiah (following the MT). Those manuscripts which do not make the addition include ℵ, B, 1, It, Vg, Sy^{pesh}, Cop$^{sa\ bo}$, and Eth.

The Literary Structure Defined

Matthew possesses a highly schematic literary structure. Even a cursory reading of these chapters makes this apparent. The genealogy (i.1-17) is followed by five scenes which either enclose (i.18-25, ii.1-12) or conclude with (ii.13-15, 16-18, 19-23) an introductory formula and OT citation.

Any serious effort to uncover the literary origins of Matthew i-ii must clearly distinguish between the basic LITERARY UNITS which these chapters display and the LITERARY FORMS which in turn comprise these structural divisions. Thus, on the one hand, Matthew i-ii exhibits six fundamental LITERARY UNITS--the genealogy (i.1-17) and the five narrative scenes (i.18-25; ii.1-12, 13-15, 16-18, 19-23). These units, on the other hand, are comprised of different kinds of material--the genealogical matter, the narrative traditions, the introductory formulas, and the OT citations. These varied kinds of material constitute four distinct LITERARY FORMS. The latter must now be defined.

1. The genealogy (i.1-17). The Matthaean genealogical list is a LITERARY FORM as well as a LITERARY UNIT. Such pioneer form critics as Rudolf Bultmann[1] and Martin Dibelius[2] pay little attention to the Matthaean table of Jesus' descent. The "genealogy," however, is a distinct literary type. Found in the literature of most ancient peoples in the Mediterranean world,[3] "genealogies of families, especially royal familes, are one of the

---

1. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 356.

2. From Tradition to Gospel, translated by Bertram Lee Woolf from the second revised edition (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 128.

3. Consult L. G. Pine, "Genealogy," Collier's Encyclopedia (24 vols.; New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1962), X, 613ff; also Jacques Meysing, "Contribution à l'étude des généalogies bibliques. Technique de la composition des chronologies babyloniennes du déluge," RScRel, XXXIX (1965), 209-29.

most widespread forms of antiquarian learning."[1] Among no group, however, did genealogical writing flourish to the great extent it did among the Jews. Their consciousness of themselves as constituting a unique people by virtue of their election by Yahweh and their stress in the post-exilic period upon racial purity made the development of genealogical writing inevitable.[2] OT historical writings make extensive use of genealogies.[3] The OT prophetic books often begin with genealogical notes;[4] and this latter practice is also attested in later Jewish literature.[5] The Matthaean genealogy reflects the influence of just such Jewish genealogical writing. Many of the names in the Matthaean table, of course, are well known OT figures whose names appear in certain OT genealogical lists.[6] More than this, however, the Matthaean genealogy probably owes certain features of its format to OT genealogical writing. In particular, the genealogical table of Gen.v.1ff (LXX) seems to have played some role in this regard. That this table has influenced the format of the Matthaean genealogy is rendered likely by the appearance of the phrase βίβλος γενέσεως in the superscriptions over both genealogies and by the repeated use throughout both genealogies of the active form ἐγέννησεν to bind the name of the father to the name of his son. The Matthaean phrase βίβλος γενέσεως recalls a similar phrase which appears twice in the LXX,

---

1. H. Munro Chadwick and N. Kershaw Chadwick, The Growth of Literature (3 vols.; Cambridge: The University Press, 1932-40), I, 270.

2. For a brief survey of Jewish genealogical writing, and comments upon the importance of family records among the Jews, see R. A. Bowman, "Genealogy," IDB, II, 362-65.

3. So Gen.v.1ff; vi.9ff; x.1ff; xi.10ff, 27ff; etc. 1 Kgs.ii.10ff; xi.41ff; xiv.29ff; xv.9ff; etc. 1 Chr.i.1ff.

4. Particularly, Zeph.i.1; Zech.i.1.

5. II Esdr.i.1-3; Tob.i.1; Josephus, Life i.1.

6. Compare 1 Chr.i-ii with Mt.i.2-12 and Ruth iv.18-22 with Mt.i.3b-6a.

Gen.ii.4a and v.1a. In Gen.ii.4a, however, the expression does not strictly speaking reflect a genealogical meaning.[1] The verse can probably best be translated, "This is the story (or, "the account," or "the history") of the origin of the heavens and the earth. . . ." The LXX tends to view this verse as a superscription of what follows--the account of the creation, the fall, and the early generations of man (ii.4b-iv.26).[2] But in Gen.v.1a the phrase clearly possesses a genealogical meaning.[3] Here the verse reads, "This is the genealogy (literally, "the book of the generations") of Adam." In its LXX context this title sentence introduces the list of the ten generations of Adam (v.1b-32) and perhaps the brief account of the wickedness of man in the time of Noah (vi.1-8). The likelihood that the Matthaean phrase βίβλος γενέσεως owes its ultimate origin to these LXX passages, particularly Gen.v.1, is enhanced by the fact that elsewhere in Jewish genealogical literature "the

---

1. In Gen.ii.4a (LXX) ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως translates the MT אֵלֶּה תוֹלְדוֹת ("These are the generations . . ."). Quite common in the MT of Genesis, this phrase is usually rendered by αὗται αἱ γενέσεις (see Gen.vi.9; x.1; xi.10, 27; xxv.12, 19; xxxvi.1, 9; xxxvii.2; also Num.iii.1). Thus the reading ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως in Gen.ii.4a (LXX) is probably an assimilation to Gen.v.1a (LXX). Both Aquila and Symmachus read αὗται αἱ γενέσεις in the former verse.

2. The question as to whether Gen.ii.4a serves as a subscription referring back to Gen.i.1-ii.3 or as a superscription introducing Gen.ii.4b-iv.26 constitutes one of the most debated issues in Pentateuchal criticism. For the suggestion that in its original MT setting Gen.ii.4a refers back to the first creation story but that the LXX tends to view the verse as a heading for the second creation story, consult the following: Allen, Matthew, p.1; and Johannes Brinktrine, "Gn 2, 4a, Uberschrift oder Unterschrift?," BibZeit, IX (1965), 277.

3. In Gen.v.1a (LXX) ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως translates the MT סֵפֶר תוֹלְדוֹת ("the book of the generations"). Commenting upon the MT, Gerhard von Rad claims that Gen.v.1 preserves the beginning of an actual book: "There was once a 'toledoth book,' consisting only of genealogies, lists, and at the most, quite brief theological remarks. Its ancient title is preserved for us in ch.5.1. This book formed the oldest foundation of the priestly document, from which it slowly grew by purposeful expansion to include the most varied sacred traditions." Genesis: a Commentary, translated by John H. Marks ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 68.

phrase βίβλος γενέσεως was not customary for a genealogy."[1] Furthermore, the Matthaean usage of ἐγέννησεν in the table of Jesus' descent recalls a similar employment of the same verb in such OT (LXX)[2] family lists as Gen.v.1ff, xi.10ff, and Ruth iv.18-22.[3] Striking in this regard is the presence of the verb in the list of Adam's descendents in Gen.v.1; for it is just this list that bears the superscription containing βίβλος γενέσεως with a genealogical meaning and function. Thus the Matthaean genealogy owes certain features of its format to OT genealogical writing, particularly to the table of Gen.v.1ff (LXX). In spite of the literary affinities between the OT genealogies and the Matthaean table, however, the theological differences are great. The latter is the genealogy of Jesus Christ, that is Jesus Messiah. Whatever other theological interests the Matthaean list of Jesus' family ties may reflect, this much is clear: it aims to establish him as the Christ.[4] It is precisely this christological concern that unites the Matthaean genealogy with the Lucan genealogy over against the genealogies of the OT.

2. The narrative traditions (i.18-ii.23). In their respective analyses of Matthew i-ii, Rudolf Bultmann[5] and Martin Dibelius[6] devote most of their

---

1. W. D. Davies, Sermon on the Mount, p. 68, n.2; also see Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (5 vols.; München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922-), I, 1ff. Hereafter cited as S-B.

2. MT: וַיּוֹלֶד from ילד.

3. Compare this style of genealogical writing with that in 1 Chr.i.1ff; also Lk.iii.23ff. Generally the Chronicler prefers simply to list the names without any connecting verbs. St. Luke connects the names by the use of the definite article in the genitive case.

4. The theological import of the Matthaean table of Jesus' descent will be discussed at some length in the next chapter.

5. Synoptic Tradition, pp. 291-94, 304.

6. Tradition, pp. 128-31.

energies to an examination of the narrative portions of these chapters. In characterizing the kind of narrative LITERARY FORM represented by these traditions, both identify them as "legends"--more specifically, personal or biographical legends. To Bultmann legends are "those parts of the /synoptic/ tradition which are not miracle stories in the proper sense, but instead of being historical in character are religious and edifying."[1] To Dibelius legends are "religious narratives of a saintly man in whose works and fate interest is taken."[2] According to these rather broad definitions, the narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii are in many respects legendary. The weakness of Bultmann's and Dibelius' consideration of the Matthaean infancy stories does not actually lie in their characterization of these traditions as legend. Rather the real weakness of their study resides in their failure to recognize the particular legends with which the Matthaean narratives have most in common. Invariably Bultmann and Dibelius turn to pagan stories of the birth and infancy of extraordinary men as preserving the closest parallel and even sometimes constituting the origin of such motifs as the virginal conception, the visit of the Magi, the strange star, and the attempted murder and rescue of the infant. No doubt the Matthaean infancy traditions do reflect many motifs that also appear in pagan stories. The most fruitful recent literary analyses of Matthew i-ii, however, are those which expose the extent to which the Matthaean infancy narratives have been shaped in the light of certain motifs and stories prominent in the OT and, above all else, Jewish

---

1. Synoptic Tradition, p. 244.

2. Tradition, p. 104. Dibelius, however, admits that such portions of the Matthaean birth narratives as i.18-25 fit quite imperfectly this category. See his "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium," Botschaft und Geschichte ("Zur Evangelienforschungen"; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), I, 24.

haggadic tradition.[1] In the present text of Matthew i-ii, the narrative traditions are joined to explicit OT quotations by means of introductory formulas so that the traditions interpret the citations and the citations interpret the traditions. Even apart from these OT quotations, however, the Matthaean infancy stories betray the influence of various OT passages and Jewish haggadic material.

Whatever the origin of the virginal birth notion, the Matthaean account of Jesus' birth (i.18-25) is modeled on the birth stories of the OT.[2] In particular, the accounts of the births of Ishmael (Gen.xvi.1-16) and Samson (Judg.xiii.2-25) seem quite influential in this regard.

That which most conspicuously points to the OT birth stories as the paradigms for the Matthaean story of Jesus' birth is the appearance in the latter of the ἄγγελος Κυρίου , the Angel of the Lord. Both the name and the function of this angelic figure recall the ἄγγελος Κυρίου , that is the מלאך יהוה , of the OT's historical traditions.[3] Conspicuously standing

---

1. The most significant recent literary analyses of Matthew i-ii include the following: Muñoz Iglesias, "El género literario del Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," EstBib, VII (1958), 243-73 ("The Literary Genre of the Infancy Gospel in St. Matthew," TheolDig, IX (1961), 15-20); David Daube, "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," NTS, V (1959), 174-87; P. J. Thompson, "The Infancy Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke Compared," Studia Evangelica, 217-22; Bourke, "Matthew 1-2," 160-75; C. H. Cave, "St. Matthew's Infancy Narrative," NTS, IX (1963), 382-90; and Davies, Sermon on the Mount, pp. 61-93.

2. Gen.xvi.1-16, xvii.15-21, xxi.1-7, xxv.21-26; Judg.xiii.2-25; 1 Sam.i. 1-20.

3. Compare this Angel of the Lord with the myriad of angelic beings who swarm through the pages of apocalyptic literature. No other angelic figure in the NT is more reminiscent of the מלאך יהוה than the ἄγγελος Κυρίου of Matthew i-ii. This includes the ἄγγελος Κυρίου of Luke i-ii; for the portrait of the latter has been influenced by apocalyptic angelology. For instance, the angel is called Gabriel, the name of the angel in Daniel ix. But the ἄγγελος Κυρίου in Acts (as v.19, viii.26, etc.) does approximate the מלאך יהוה of the OT.

out from angels in general, the מלאך יהוה serves as the representative of Yahweh. Although it is difficult to sum up the significance of all the OT references to the מלאך יהוה, generally "he is a being who helps and who everywhere acts in Israel's favor, saving and protecting her; he is Jahweh's aid to Israel personalized almost in the way of a mediating official of the covenant relationship."[1] Specifically, however, the מלאך יהוה is Yahweh's emissary who announces the conception, birth, and reveals the name of such persons as Ishmael (Gen.xvi.1-16) and Samson (Judg.xiii.2-25). Interestingly enough, the above description of the role of the OT's מלאך יהוה fits precisely the role of the Matthaean ἄγγελος Κυρίου. Generally, in the Matthaean infancy stories the ἄγγελος Κυρίου continues to mediate the covenant relationship between Yahweh and His people and to aid His people. Indeed, the ἄγγελος Κυρίου both proclaims that Jesus will save his people from their sins (i.21) and secures the safety of the one who will effect that salvation (ii.13, 19). Specifically, the ἄγγελος Κυρίου announces the conception, birth, and reveals the name of Jesus (i.18-25). The appearance of the Angel of the Lord in the Matthaean story of Jesus' birth does point to the OT birth stories as the possible paradigms for the Matthaean account of Jesus' birth (i.18-25).

The basic pattern of the Matthaean birth account transforms this possibility into a probability; for that pattern agrees with the overall scheme of the OT birth stories. The latter usually exhibit three parts which can be characterized in this fashion:

---

1. Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, translated by D. M. Stalker (2 vols.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), I, 286. Relevant passages include Gen.xvi.7ff, xxi.17ff, xxii.11ff, xxxi.11ff; Ex.iii.2ff; Num. xii.21ff; Judg.ii.1ff, vi.11ff, xiii.2ff; 2 Kgs.xix.35ff.

a. The statement of the prospective mother's barrenness
b. The divine intervention and the announcement of a coming child
c. The statement of the birth and the naming of the child

a. The introductory portion of the story serves to set the stage for the intervention and appearance of Yahweh or perhaps his emissary, the Angel. This usually involves the brief mention of the prospective mother's barrenness--the barrenness of Sarai, Rebekah, Manoah's wife, or Hannah.[1] Yet often other complications are involved. Sarai's barrenness leads to the cohabitation of her husband Abraham with her maid Hagar and to the banishment of Hagar by Sarai when she conceives.[2] Finally Rebekah conceives, but the two children in her womb struggle together.[3]

b. The central section of the story is its focal point; for now Yahweh intervenes either personally[4] or through His Angel.[5] The message of Yahweh or of His representative is crucial. Indeed, "a form-critical analysis of all the birth stories in the OT reveals that the announcement of a coming child, usually by a divine messenger, is a constant element in this form and one of its characteristic elements."[6] But these divine communiqués often contain more than simply the announcement of the child's conception, birth, and the revelation of his name. Occasionally they proclaim the destiny of the child. Of Samson it was said, "He shall begin to deliver Israel from the hand of the

---

1. Gen.xvi.1; Gen.xxv.21; Judg.xiii.2; 1 Sam.i.2.
2. Gen.xvi.2-7.
3. Gen.xxv.22.
4. Gen.xxi.1f; Gen.xxv.21, 23; 1 Sam.i.19.
5. Gen.xvi.7ff; Judg.xiii.3ff.
6. Brevard S. Childs, "The Birth of Moses," JBL, LXXXIV (1965), p. 110.

Philistines."[1] Furthermore, the heavenly messages include any other instructions that might facilitate the resolution of the problems mentioned in the initial part of the story. Thus the Angel of Yahweh tells Hagar to return to Sarai her mistress.[2]

c. The final section usually consists of a terse notice of the child's birth and naming--of the birth and naming of Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob and Esau, Samson, and Samuel.[3] So the actual birth itself is rather peripheral to the OT birth story.

The Matthaean story of Jesus' birth likewise displays three divisions:

a. The statement of the prospective mother's premarital conception
b. The divine intervention and the announcement of the coming child
c. The birth and naming of the child

a. Mt.i.18b-19. The problem with which this story is introduced is virtually the opposite of the difficulty portrayed in the OT accounts: Mary has already conceived! So Joseph is reluctant to consummate their proposed marriage. Yet this opening portion of the birth story does serve to set the stage for the divine intervention and proclamation.

b. Mt.i.20-21. Attempting to resolve the difficulty, the Angel of the Lord exhorts Joseph not to be afraid and to take Mary home as his wife. Then the Angel announces the child's conception (of the Holy Spirit), birth, and makes known his name. Finally, the child's destiny is intimated, "He shall save his people from their sins."

c. Mt.i.24-25. Only in a concluding comment is the actual birth and naming of Jesus mentioned.

---

1. Judg.xiii.5; also see Gen.xvi.12.

2. Gen.xvi.9.

3. Gen.xvi.15; Gen.xxi.2f; Gen.xxv.25f; Judg.xiii.24; 1 Sam.i.20.

Thus, the Matthaean account of Jesus' birth is modeled along the lines of the OT birth narrative. But in this story the Angel of the Lord appears κατ' ὄναρ , in a dream (i.20).[1] Although the aforementioned OT birth accounts do not portray the Angel of Yahweh appearing in a dream, there are occasions in the OT historical traditions when he does so appear.[2] In Jewish haggadic lore, the dream comes into prominence as the means by which the birth of Moses is announced.[3] And Josephus reports that Amram is not only informed of the coming birth of his son Moses but also advised of the son's destined role as the deliverer of Israel.[4] In spite of such parallels with Jewish haggadic tradition, however, the Matthaean account of Jesus' birth seems to rest primarily upon the OT birth stories. The centrality of the Angel of the Lord makes this clear.

It is questionable to what extent a carefully delineated paradigm

---

1. Also see ii.13, 19; compare ii.12, 22; xxvii.19.

2. For instance, Gen.xxxi.11. This verse stems from the "Elohist" tradition of the Penteteuch, as might be supposed insofar as it is this strand of Penteteuchal tradition that often adopts dreams as a medium of divine revelation. Since this section comes from the "Elohist" source, the Angel is referred to as the מלאך האלהים rather than the מלאך יהוה .

3. For the several references, consult Muñoz Iglesias, "San Mateo," pp. 256-59.

4. Ant.II.ix.3-4. The OT story of Moses' birth contains no divine announcement of the coming child (Ex.ii.1-10). Noting this as well as other differences between the Moses birth narrative and the other OT birth stories, Brevard S. Childs develops the thesis: the former is an exposure saga, "The Birth of Moses," pp. 109-22. The amplification of the OT story of Moses' birth in haggadic tradition by the addition of such motifs as the divine announcement of that birth is probably accomplished under the influence of the other OT birth stories. So the Matthaean account of Jesus' birth and the haggadic stories of Moses' birth probably share the same models--namely, the OT birth narratives. There is no need to posit any direct relationship between the Matthaean Jesus story and the haggadic Moses accounts.

can be found for the story of the Magi's visit to the new-born babe (ii.1-12). Nevertheless, this narrative exhibits several features which, on the one hand, have counterparts in the haggadic traditions about the births of such OT personages as Moses and Abraham, and on the other hand, have parallels in OT and Rabbinic eschatological/messianic speculation.

With regard to the first group of features, for instance, some late rabbinic sources state that Moses' birth was made known to Pharaoh by astrologers (compare Mt.ii.2, 7).[1] Again, the birth of Moses was accompanied by the appearance of a strange light phenomenon; but, more significantly, on the night of Abraham's birth a large star loomed in the heavens (compare Mt.ii.2, 9).[2] Finally, at the prediction of Moses' birth, the people of Egypt reacted with great consternation (compare Mt.ii.3).[3]

The second group of features, for the most part, has its ultimate roots in the kingship ideology of pre-exilic Israel. According to the OT, the reigning Israelite monarchs received, or it was hoped that they would receive, tribute from the non-Israelite or Gentile nations. Such is the supplication of Ps.lxxii.10.[4] Later many of the Rabbis were of the opinion that the Messiah likewise would receive gifts from the Gentiles. In fact, Ps.lxxii.10 is interpreted messianically.[5] Within post-exilic Jewish eschatological/messianic speculation, a recurring theme is the question as to the

---

1. Bourke, "Matthew 1-2," p. 165.
2. S-B, I, 77ff.
3. Bourke, "Matthew 1-2," p. 164.
4. Also, Ps.lxxii.15, xlv.12; 1 Kgs.ix.28, x.2ff.
5. S-B, I, 83ff.

fate of the Gentiles.[1] The answers to this query are diverse: annihilation, bewilderment, conversion! Occasionally the suggestion is made that the Messiah will be the recipient of gifts from the Gentiles.[2] Much more common is the notion that Yahweh Himself will be the recipient of such tribute.[3] And even frankincense and myrrh are sometimes named among the offerings.[4] Perhaps even more common is the idea that the Gentiles will make a pilgrimage to Zion to worship Yahweh.[5] These visions of the age to come, however, are usually epic dramas in which the Gentiles come en masse rather than in small individualized bands (but with all the above compare, particularly, Mt.ii.2, 11).

The mention of "Egypt" (Mt.ii.13) at the very outset of the concluding mass of narrative material (Mt.ii.13-23) points to the OT account of Israel's sojourn in that land (Gen.xxxvii-Ex.xiii) and to haggadic traditions pertaining to that exile as the possible models for much that follows; for in the OT as well as later Jewish literature, Egypt is remembered primarily as the site of Israel's bondage.[6] Such is indeed the case!

In Mt.ii.20 the Angel of the Lord addresses Joseph,"Go into the land of Israel; for those who seek the life of the child are dead"(=τεθνήκασιν γὰρ οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου). These plurals are striking

---

1. Excellent discussions of this motif in the OT prophetic writings and in the intertestamental literature are to be found in the following: J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962), pp. 397ff, 415ff; and D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic ("The Old Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 300ff.

2. For example, Pss.Sol.xvii.34; and I Enoch liii.1. In the latter context, however, the gifts to the Elect One are to no avail. In spite of these gifts the Gentiles are annihilated.

3. Isa.xviii.7, lx..5ff; Zeph.iii.10; Sibyl.Or.iii.772; also Isa.xlv.14; Hag.ii.7.

4. Isa.lx..6; Sibyl.Or.iii.772.

5. Isa.ii.2-4, xlv.14ff, lvi.7, lx.3, lxvi.18ff, Jer.iii.17; Micah iv.2; Zeph.iii.9-10; Zech.viii.20-23; xiv.16-19.

6. The OT and later Jewish references in this regard are too numerous to mention. Furthermore, they are not lacking in the NT (Acts vii.2ff; Heb.iii. 16, viii.9; and Jude 5).

insofar as only Herod has been mentioned as having sought the child's life and as having himself died (Mt.ii.13, 16, 19). It has long been recognized that these plurals result from the influence of Ex.iv.19 (LXX) upon this Matthaean verse.[1] In the OT passage the Lord speaks to Moses during his self-imposed exile in Midian, "Go back to Egypt, for those who seek your life are dead (= τεθνήκασιν γὰρ πάντες οἱ ζητοῦντες σου τὴν ψυχήν)."

On the basis of this correspondence, Muñoz Iglesias concludes that the OT account of Moses' flight to Midian constitutes the basic paradigm for this entire section (Mt.ii.13ff) and Pharaoh's ordinance to kill the Hebrew male infants (Ex.i.22) has influenced the slaughter of the children (Mt.ii.16).[2]

David Daube does not deny the equation Mt.ii.20=Ex.iv.19, but he does object to reading the entire mass of narrative material (Mt.ii.13ff) in the light of this find; for he declares that Mt.ii.13-18 has a literary history apart from and different from Mt.ii.19ff.[3] To make his point he notes several discrepancies between the Matthaean story of Joseph's flight to Egypt and the subsequent massacre of the infants, on the one hand, and the OT accounts of Moses' flight to Midian and Pharaoh's ordinance, on the other: Joseph escapes to Egypt to return to Israel, but Moses escapes to Midian to return to Egypt; Joseph escapes at God's behest, but Moses escapes of his own free will; Joseph escapes with his family for the sake of one of its members, but Moses escapes alone for his own sake; and Herod's decree includes all children under two years of age, but Pharaoh's ordinance applies only to the male offspring. According to Daube, however, all these difficulties disappear when the Matthaean account (ii.13-18) is viewed in the light of the Passover

---

1. So Davies, Sermon on the Mount, p. 78.

2. "San Mateo," pp. 268ff.

3. For Daube's detailed analysis, see his "Earliest Structure," pp. 184ff.

Haggadah of Jacob's flight to avoid the persecution of Laban: Jacob escaped to Egypt to return to Israel; Jacob escaped at God's behest made known in a dream; Jacob escaped with his family for the sake of the future messiah who would spring from his family; and Laban tried to kill all. Thus, Daube concludes:

> The Massacre, then, is influenced by Pharaoh's ordinance only at a remove--that is, only insofar as that ordinance inspired the Haggadah legend of Laban. It is with the latter that the Massacre is in direct touch. The genealogy is, first, the biblical picture of Pharaoh, second, its rabbinic elaboration, third, the transfer in the Haggadah of the elaborated picture, darkened to Laban, and fourth, the Massacre. As for Moses' flight, that is not alluded to at all in Matt.ii.13-18. The allusions are exclusively to Jacob's flight, as represented in the Haggadah.[1]

The persuasiveness of Daube's analysis leads Myles Bourke to declare that "the conceptual connections between Mt.2,13-18 and the midrash are too remarkable to be accidental."[2] So along with the other narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii, this concluding portion of these chapters displays several connections with OT stories and, more directly, haggadic tradition.

The preceding survey of the narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii does not exhaust all the possible ties between these traditions and OT-haggadic material. It does, however, establish the extent to which the former has received its present shape in the light of the latter.

Midrash haggadah may be defined in this way: "All scriptural interpretation which is nonlegal or narrative in character, and which aims at the development of inner piety and religious devotion. . . .The Haggadic method of instruction is by means of story, saga, legend, parable, homily, maxim, proverbs, and wise sayings."[3] At the very core of midrash haggadah, therefore, is

---

1. Daube, "Earliest Structure," p. 185.
2. "Matthew 1-2," p. 171.
3. I. Epstein, "Haggadah," IDB, II, 509.

reflection upon the scriptures. Insofar as the narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii owe much of their present form to similar reflection (as well as reflection upon certain Jewish haggadic traditions themselves, that is reflection upon reflections), they display affinities with the stories of haggadic lore.[1] Both stem from something of a reflective process which is oriented toward the OT. This means that although Rudolf Bultmann and Martin Dibelius are not wrong in characterizing the LITERARY FORM of these Matthaean narratives as legend, they do err in not recognizing the legends of Jewish haggadic tradition as the stories with which these Matthaean narratives have most in common. Yet similarity must not be confused with identity. As noted, the aim of the midrash haggadah which underlies these Jewish stories is the cultivation of inner piety and the development of religious devotion. No doubt the intention of the kind of scriptural interpretation which underlies the Matthaean infancy legends is quite similar.[2] Yet this latter Christian interpretative procedure accomplishes its end in a rather roundabout way; for it reflects upon the OT and/or certain Jewish haggadic legends in order to elucidate the birth and infancy of Jesus the Christ, that is the Messiah, rather than simply to expound scripture itself. Thus, the legends of Jewish haggadic tradition are primarily stories about OT personages; but the legends of Matthew i-ii are stories about this Jesus. It is this christological factor that separates the Matthaean infancy narratives from the stories of

---

1. This does not necessarily mean that absolutely no historical residue underlies the Matthaean infancy traditions. But as noted in the introduction, the pursuit of such a residue or the denial of it lies beyond the scope of this study. For recent comments on the possibility of a historical substratum beneath these infancy stories by those who affirm the midrashic character of the traditions, see the following: Bourke, "Matthew 1-2," pp. 174-175, and Jeann Racette, "L'évangile de l'enfance selon saint Matthieu," ScE, IX (1957), 77-82.

2. Paul Minear, "The Interpreter and the Nativity Stories," TTod, VII (1950), 358-75. Minear suggests that the Matthaean infancy stories show signs of use in worship.

Jewish haggadic tradition.

3. The introductory formulas (i.22; ii.5b, 15b, 17, 23b). Neither Rudolf Bultmann nor Martin Dibelius characterizes such formulas as a LITERARY FORM. The "introductory formula," however, is a distinct literary type. Within the writings of many ancient peoples, divine oracles are frequently introduced by rather formalized comments.[1] Among the Jews such a practice is clearly evidenced within the OT itself insofar as the prophetic oracles are introduced by such catchphrases as, "Thus says Yahweh" (=כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה). Also, it is among the Jews that such introductory formulas become a well-defined literary type. Such writings as the Rabbinic literature and the scrolls of the Dead Sea Sectarians disclose the full extent of this development. The basic presupposition for this development, of course, is the acceptance of a body of writings--generally those now comprising the OT--as authoritative and thus worthy of study and explicit citation. Emerging from within Judaism, the nascent Christian movement not only assumed the authority of the OT but also continued the custom of introducing scriptural quotations with set formulas.[2] Thus, most NT introductory statements have counterparts in the various writings of the NT and in Jewish literature.[3] In many respects

---

1. See James B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts (2nd ed.; Princeton, N. J.: University Press, 1955), pp. 441-52. Hereafter cited as ANET. For instance, certain oracles concerning Esarhaddon of Assyria (ca. 680-69 b.c.) are prefaced with such phrases as "(Oracle) from the lips of the woman Ishtar-latashiat of Arbela" and "(Oracle) of the woman Rimute-allate of the city of Darahuya which is in the midst of the mountains."

2. For the different formulas Paul uses to introduce OT citations, for instance, consult E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 22-25.

3. Bruce Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," JBL, LXX (1951), 297-307. Joseph Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," NTS, VII (1961), 297-333. The above discussion of the introductory formulas in Matthew i-ii and their similarity with formulas found in such Jewish literature as the Rabbinic writings and the Dead Sea Scrolls is greatly indebted to these articles.

the formulas of Matthew i-ii are no exception. They have parallels in the other books of the NT and/or Jewish sources.

Among the five introductory statements of Matthew i-ii, only one differs considerably from the rest: οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (ii.5b). This formula has very close parallels in both other Christian and Jewish writings. Paul frequently uses the Greek verbal form γέγραπται in his introductory statements; and in his Corinthian correspondence he prefaces an OT quotation with the words οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται (1 Cor.xv.45).[1] In meaning the Greek verbal form γέγραπται corresponds to the Hebrew passive participle כתוב. Both may be rendered, "It is written." This participial form is frequently used in formulas in both Rabbinic literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Furthermore, the Dead Sea Scrolls include a prefatory formula which closely approximates the Matthaean phrase οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται, namely כי֣א כן כתוב (1QS v.15; CD xi.18). Thus, these phrases read, "For so it is written."

Although occasionally differing from one another in exact wording, the other four formulas of Matthew i-ii share a common pattern--a pattern, incidentally, shared by six introductory statements elsewhere in the Gospel. These ten formulas are as follows:

Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (i.22)

ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (ii.15b)

τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (ii.17)

ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν (ii.23b)

ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (iv.14)

---

1. Ellis, Paul's Use of OT, p. 22.

ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (viii.17a)

ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (xii.17)

ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (xiii.35a)

Τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (xxi.4)

τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (xxvii.9a)

Viewed over against the other formulas in the NT which introduce OT citations, the latter portion of these Matthaean formulas (beginning with τὸ ῥηθέν, etc.) is characteristically Matthaean. In fact, the feature which stamps the concluding half typically Matthaean is precisely this definite article followed by the aorist passive participle, τὸ ῥηθέν. This construction appears in Matthaean introductory formulas at least twelve times; and neither the construction nor the aorist passive participle itself is attested elsewhere in the NT.[1] They do, however, have counterparts of sorts in the Hebrew expression שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר ("what was spoken") and the Hebrew verbal form נֶאֱמַר ("it was spoken"). These are quite prominent in the Rabbinic literature; and Bruce Metzger underscores their prominence with these words: "By far the majority of quotations in the Mishnah are introduced by the verb אָמַר . . . . By far the largest number of instances of formulas containing אָמַר involve the niph'al form נֶאֱמַר . . . Most frequent of all is the expression שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר."[2]

---

1. John C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (2nd ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909), pp. 7, 33. Acts, however, preserves a similar construction in at least one introductory statement: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ (ii.16). But here the perfect passive participle εἰρημένον is used.

2. "NT and Mishnah," pp. 298-99. Interestingly enough, The Dead Sea Scrolls do not use either the niph'al נֶאֱמַר or the expression שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר in introductory formulas. Fitzmyer, "Qumran and NT," p. 305.

Besides this element of correspondence between the Matthaean formulas and those in Rabbinic sources, however, there are entire formulas in the latter which closely parallel the concluding portion (beginning with τὸ ῥηθέν , etc.) of these Matthaean introductory statements: for instance, זהו שנאמר ברוח הקודש על ידי ("This is what was spoken by the Holy Spirit through, etc.").[1] Thus, the concluding half of the Matthaean formulas unite them with characteristically Rabbinic introductory formulas over against most of the NT prefatory statements. But this is only part of the story insofar as each of the Matthaean formulas contains in its first half some form of the verb πληρόω . Meaning "to fulfill," the verb indicates that the preceding narrated happenings fulfill the affixed OT citation; hence these formulas are often referred to as fulfilment formulas. The Gospel of John also preserves introductory formulas which use the verb πληρόω in a similar manner.[2] According to Bruce Metzger[3] and Joseph Fitzmyer,[4] neither the Rabbinic writings nor the Dead Sea Scrolls use a verbal form (such as מלא , "to fulfill") in a comparable way.[5] Thus, the initial half of the Matthaean introductory formulas unites them with characteristically NT formulas over against the Jewish prefatory statements. Fitzmyer's explanation of the absence of such fulfilment formulas in the Qumran writings is also applicable to their absence in the Rabbinic literature:

---

1. S-B, I, pp. 74-75.

2. Jn.xii.38, xiii.18, xv.25, xvii.9, xix.24, 36. But notice how the overall pattern of these Johannine fulfilment formulas differs from the overall pattern of the Matthaean fulfilment formulas.

3. "NT and Mishnah," pp. 306-307.

4. "Qumran and NT," pp. 303-304.

5. But compare S-B, I, p. 74.

> Probably the real reason for the lack of "fulfilment" formulae in the Qumran literature is that they are a peculiarly New Testament type. More fundamental still is probably the difference of outlook which characterizes the two groups. The Qumran theology is still dominated by a forward look, an expectation of what is to come about in the eschaton, whereas the Christian theology is more characterized by a backward glance, seeing the culmination of all that preceded in the advent of Christ.[1]

So although in many respects the Matthaean fulfilment formulas closely parallel certain Jewish introductory statements, in the final analysis they disclose a christological concern that sets them over against these Jewish formulas and establishes them as a peculiarly Christian type.

4. The OT citations (i.23; ii.6, 15c, 18, 23c). Broadly defined as "oracles" these quotations constitute what might be called the fourth LITERARY FORM of Matthew i-ii; yet again neither Rudolf Bultmann nor Martin Dibelius characterize them as such. Divine oracles, however, are attested in the writings of many ancient peoples.[2] Much of what was said with regard to the introductory formulas, however, involved specifically OT quotations. Indeed, the emergence of the introductory formula as a well-defined literary type in Judaism and early Christianity presupposed the study and explicit citation of the OT. Needless to say, both Jewish and Christian literature abound with such OT quotations. As a literary type, however, the quotations of Matthew i-ii can probably be defined more narrowly.

It has long been recognized that the five OT quotations of Matthew i-ii along with some six OT quotations found elsewhere in the Gospel (iv.15-16; viii.17b; xii.18-21; xiii.35b-c; xxvii.9b-10) belong to a special class of Matthaean OT citations. These eleven OT citations constitute the "Reflexions-zitate" or formula quotations. They share certain formal and textual traits.

---

1. "Qumran and NT," pp. 303-304.

2. Pritchard, ANET, pp. 441-452.

Formally, these OT citations are introduced by fulfilment formulas and thus stand in the Gospel text as clear editorial comments upon the events therein narrated.[1]

Textually, these OT citations agree much less closely with the LXX than do the other Matthaean OT citations. John Hawkins established this simply by counting the number of LXX words as opposed to non-LXX words in all the Matthaean quotations.[2] Acknowledging his indebtedness to Hawkins, Krister Stendahl goes a step further. He compares the text of these eleven quotations not only to the text of the LXX but to the later Greek versions, the MT, the Targums, and the OT Peshitta. Thus, he makes a more positive assessment of the textual peculiarities of the Matthaean formula quotations:

> Hawkins's statistics suggested a remarkable boundary between the Matthew formula quotations and other quotations in Matthew. Our detailed study has confirmed and elaborated this impression. But the lack of resemblance to the LXX in formula quotations, which is the only factor Hawkins takes note of, did not always imply a greater verbal agreement with the M.T. In all cases we could suppose a knowledge of the Hebrew text, but in its interpretation Matthew shows great freedom and a tendency to make use of readings which we could often support by examples from various LXX manuscripts, the later Greek versions, the Targums, and even the OT Peshitta.[3]

---

1. With regard to these formal characteristics, the quotation of Micah v.2 (= Mt.ii.6) is an exception. It is neither introduced by a fulfilment formula nor is it an editorial comment. It appears on the lips of the chief priests and scribes who cite it as the scriptural basis for their reply to Herod that the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem. The formula with which the quotation is introduced probably lacks the customary reference to fulfilment precisely because the quotation does appear on the lips of the chief priests and scribes, so Krister Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament ("Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis," 20; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954), p. 97, n. 1. Hereafter cited as SSM. In spite of the formal deficiencies, however, this citation belongs to the fulfilment quotation category. Its textual peculiarities as well as its narrative setting demand this.

2. Horae Synopticae, pp. 154-58.

3. SSM, p. 151.

Thus, differentiated from the other Matthaean OT citations both by their introductory formulas and by their text, these eleven formula quotations comprise a special class of Matthaean OT quotations.

Stendahl's careful textual analysis of the OT citations in the Gospel of St. Matthew, however, not only threw into relief as never before the textual peculiarities shared by the formula quotations but also opened a whole new range of possibilities for understanding the latter as representing a particular type of OT citation. The strange mixed character of the formula quotations' text prompted Stendahl to explain them as the finished products of a very scholarly exegetical procedure practiced by the School of St. Matthew, a school for church leaders and teachers.[1] Guided by the assumption that OT prophecy has been fulfilled in the events of Jesus' life, Christian scribes view that prophecy in the light of those events and those events in the light of that prophecy. So there is interaction between the words of OT prophecy and the details of its fulfilment. The prophetic words influence the re-telling of the details and the details correspondingly affect the form of the prophetic text. In this process the scribes of the Matthaean School adopt the reading--MT, LXX, Targums, or even original--most appropriate for its application to the events of Jesus' life. Stendahl sees this kind of exegetical procedure as analogous to the midrash pesher practiced by the Dead Sea Sectarians in their Habakkuk Commentary.[2]

It seems highly improbable that these formula citations owe their unusual textual character to the kind of scrupulous exegetical procedure

---

1. SSM, p. 35.

2. Stendahl, SSM, pp. 183-202. The name pesher used to describe this kind of midrash is derived from the word פשרו ("its interpretation") with which the exposition of the OT text begins in the biblical commentaries of the Qumran Sect.

posited by Stendahl.[1] Nevertheless, it seems highly probable that these formula citations do owe their peculiar textual form to some kind of interaction between the words of OT prophecy and the details of its fulfilment in the life of Jesus. For instance, the Matthaean text of Micah v.2 reads: "And you, O Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, you are by no means least (=οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ)among the rulers of Judah. . . ." (Mt.ii.6). The forceful negative οὐδαμῶς has no support in either the MT or the LXX. According to these versions, Bethlehem is "little" (=צָעִיר) or "few in number" (=ὀλιγοστὸς); yet in the light of Jesus the Messiah's actual emergence from Bethlehem, the Christian interpreter disavows Bethlehem's insignificance. Now Bethlehem becomes by no means least. Again, the Matthaean text of Hosea xi.1 reads, "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (=Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου, Mt.ii.15c). The text itself is not peculiarly Christian; for it seems to be an exact translation of the MT. Yet the application of this prophecy to the events of Jesus' life has necessitated the retention of its MT character insofar as the LXX says, "Out of Egypt have I called his [i.e. Israel's] children (=Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ)." Repeatedly Stendahl uncovers readings in the formula quotations which have possibly arisen or been retained as the result of the interaction between the words of OT prophecy and the details of its fulfilment in the life of Jesus.[2]

The phenomenon of OT quotations acquiring their textual form through the interaction between the text and its interpretation is by no means confined to the Matthaean formula citations. Elsewhere in the NT a similar process is

---

1. Several reasons for this improbability will be set forth in the critical analysis of the introductory formula-OT citation clusters, pp. 51-59.

2. SSM, pp. 97-127.

probably reflected in some of the non-LXX texts of the Gospel of John, particularly in the Johannine formula citations.[1] Within Jewish literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls certainly preserve OT texts and quotations whose textual forms to some extent have been influenced by their interpretation. This is true not only of the biblical commentaries (that is, the pesharim)[2] but also of the other writings as well.[3] Thus, besides comprising simply a special class of Matthaean OT quotations, the Matthaean formula citations represent a more general type of OT quotation: the type in which the textual form of the OT quotation stems in part from the interaction between that citation and its interpretation. Perceiving this type of quotation or text in the commentaries of the Dead Sea Sect, Krister Stendahl spoke of such quotations as pesher quotations. Yet perhaps such a label is a bit restrictive.[4] Firstly, this designation does not do justice to the extent of such quotations within the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves; for, as pointed out above, quotations whose textual forms are partly attributable to the influence of their interpretation are also found in other Qumran writings besides the pesharim. Secondly, and more importantly, this designation tends to blur the differences between the OT quotations in the Dead Sea Scrolls whose textual forms reflect the influence of their interpretation and those in the NT, such as the Matthaean

---

1. SSM, pp. 162-63; also, Edwin D. Freed, Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John ("Supplements to Novum Testamentum," 11; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), pp. 117-30.

2. SSM, pp. 183-202.

3. Fitzmyer, "Qumran and NT," pp. 316-25.

4. Stendahl has frequently been criticized in this regard, for instance, Bertil Gärtner, "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of St. Matthew," Studia Theologica, VIII (1954), 1-24, and Fitzmyer, "Qumran and NT," p. 331.

formula quotations, whose textual forms also reflect the influence of their interpretation. That which primarily separates the latter from the former is none other than the kind of interpretation which exerts a creative influence upon the text; for the peculiar textual forms of the Matthaean formula quotations were born of a christological concern that is lacking or at least unrealized among the Dead Sea Sectarians. It was this same christological concern that prompted the prefacing of these Matthaean formula quotations with the unique fulfilment formulas. Thus, rather than using the term pesher in a generic sense as does Stendahl, perhaps it is best to seek another term to designate the type of OT quotations whose textual forms stem in part from their interpretation. Perhaps they can be called interpretative-quotations;[1] and so both the pesher quotations of the Qumran commentaries and the formula quotations are representatives of this type of Old Testament quotation.

The preceding survey confirms the claim that the different kinds of material which comprise Matthew i-ii constitute four distinct LITERARY FORMS. Broadly defined these forms are genealogy, legend, introductory formula, and oracle. Although these forms are represented in the writings of many ancient peoples, it is the representatives of these forms in Jewish literature to which the forms of Matthew i-ii bear closest kinship. The genealogy reflects the influence of OT genealogical writing. The legends recall the legends of haggadic lore. The introductory formulas have counterparts in the introductory formulas of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Rabbinic sources. Finally, the oracles are OT citations and resemble the pesher quotations of the Qumran

---

1. Such a designation is suggested by the comments of Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 15, n. 4.

writings.

In spite of this kinship between the forms of Matthew i-ii and similar forms of Jewish literature, however, one decisive factor distinguishes the former from the latter: the christological interest of the Matthaean forms! The genealogy is the genealogy of Jesus the Christ. The legends are stories about the infancy of this Jesus. The introductory formulas are fulfilment formulas which bind together the events of Jesus' early years with the prophetic oracles. Finally, the oracles are OT quotations which owe their textual form to the interaction between the texts and the reported happenings of Jesus the Christ's infancy.

This means that the literary genre of Matthew i-ii is neither midrash haggadah[1] nor midrash pesher.[2] To claim either as the literary genre of the Matthaean infancy account is to commit two errors. Firstly, such a claim absolutizes one of the literary forms of Matthew i-ii at the expense of the other three. Secondly, such a claim glosses over the christological factor that pervades the forms of Matthew i-ii both individually and collectively. These pitfalls are avoided, however, when the literary genre of the Matthaean infancy account is viewed as Gospel. It is widely recognized that the four gospels comprise a unique genre of literature.[3] The folk books of Christians, the gospels portray the life, death, and resurrection of the one to whom these folk owe their existence--namely, Jesus the Christ. The Matthaean infancy account is no less the product of these folk. The Matthaean infancy account is no less concerned with this Jesus the Christ. So it is

---

1. Bourke, "Matthew 1-2," p. 174. Iglesias, "San Mateo," p. 270.

2. By implication, Stendahl, SSM, pp. 183-202.

3. Otto A. Piper, "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," JBL, LXXVIII (1959), 115-124. Kendrick Grobel, "Gospels," IDB, II, 449. The above definition of the gospels as folk books is indebted to the suggestion of Professor Grobel. Both Piper and Grobel, however, tend to view the infancy stories in both St. Luke and St. Matthew as something less than Gospel.

fitting and proper to define the literary genre of Matthew i-ii as Gospel.

The Literary Structure Analyzed

The distinction between the LITERARY UNITS and the LITERARY FORMS of Matthew i-ii becomes of some importance when one turns from definition to analysis. At what stage in the literary history of these chapters did the agglomeration of their components occur? When were the different LITERARY FORMS brought together in such a way as to comprise six well-defined LITERARY UNITS? Is the present highly schematic literary structure of Matthew i-ii the work of the First Evangelist? Was it delivered to him in some source? Oral? Written? What were the sources behind the individual forms? The genealogy? The narrative traditions? The introductory formulas? The OT citations? Were these sources oral or written? To a consideration of these questions the discussion now turns.

The genealogy (i.1-17). The ultimate source for much of the matter in the Matthaean genealogy is the OT. For instance, scattered through the genealogical lists of 1 Chr.i-iii are the names of Jesus' male ancestors from Abraham through Zerubbabel (= Mt.i.1-12). The brief table of Perez's descendents in Ruth iv.18-22 culminates with David (= Mt.i.3b-6a). Yet nowhere in the OT is Rahab designated the wife of Salmon and thus the mother of Boaz (Mt.i.5a).[1] Furthermore, no OT passage, or passages, provides the names of Jesus' forebears from Abiud through Joseph (Mt.i.13-16).[2] So it is evident

---

1. Non-OT traditions are also silent in this regard. Among the Rabbis Rahab is given in marriage to Joshua, S-B, I, 20-23.

2. Compare Lk.iii.23ff.

that although the OT may be the ultimate source for portions of the Matthaean genealogy, the latter was not simply taken over *in toto* from the former.

Therefore, the crucial question is this: is the genealogy in its present form of Matthaean or pre-Matthaean composition? As it now stands, is the genealogy attributable in some sense to the hand of the First Evangelist or did he find it in some source?

Because it constitutes a peculiar literary form, the genealogy affords little opportunity for conclusive linguistic or stylistic analysis. Nevertheless, the little evidence it does offer in this regard is not inconsistent with the suggestion of Matthaean composition. Linguistically, λεγόμενος is an expression characteristic of Matthaean speech usage.[1] Again, for the most part the forms of the names in the table of descent are Septuagintal; and elsewhere in the Gospel the First Evangelist is primarily dependent upon the LXX.[2] Stylistically, the numerical arrangement of the genealogy is in keeping with the editorial practice of the First Evangelist. He often arranges incidents and dominical sayings into numerical groups.[3]

More than this, however, certain features of the genealogy suggest that it, along with the superscription and the concluding summary, was compiled with a view toward its placement at the head of the Gospel immediately prior to the story of the virginal conception.

Firstly, this table of Jesus' descent is more than just a genealogy. It is a brief résumé of salvation-history, of God's dealings with Israel; and

---

1. Mt.i.16. Compare Mt.x.2 with Mk.iii.16 and Mt.xxvii.17, 22 with Mk.xv. 9, 12.

2. B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930), pp. 470-77. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), pp. 56-57. Stendahl, *SSM*, pp. 147-51.

3. Allen, *Matthew*, pp. lxv, 5-6.

thereby a demonstration that with Jesus the Christ (vs.17) that history reaches its intended goal. The heading above the genealogy mentions the two great figures of that history to whom Jesus is heir: Abraham, the father of the nation; and David, the founder of the royal dynasty (vs.1). The concluding summary calls attention to the three-fold division of the preceding list which agrees with the three great epochs in Israel's history: So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ are fourteen generations (vs.17). In the list itself, reference is made to brothers at crucial points in the history of God's dealing with Israel (vss.2, 11). Among the sons of Jacob it was Judah who was chosen to sire Israel's royal-messianic line.[1] Among the sons of Josiah it was Jechoniah who was chosen to perpetuate that royal-messianic line.[2] Thus these references to Judah and his brothers (vs.2) and to Jechoniah and his brothers (vs.11) underscore the salvation-history character of the genealogy.[3] This salvation-history motif is quite appropriate in a genealogy

---

1. Gen.xlix.10; and S-B, I, 14f.

2. 1 Chr.iii.15ff (LXX), Ezra iii.iff; and S-B, I, 32-35. According to the OT, however, it is Jehoiakim who has Josiah for a father and several brothers; and Jehoiakim is the father of Jechoniah. So the Matthaean genealogy omits the name of Jehoiakim from the line of succession and endows Jechoniah with claims that rightfully belong to the former. The schematic arrangement of the genealogy into tiers of fourteen generations has necessitated such an omission. A similar omission for the same reason appears earlier in the Matthaean list: and Joram was the father of Uzziah (vs.8). But according to the OT, Joram was the father of Ahaziah, Ahaziah was the father of Joash, Joash was the father of Amaziah, and Amaziah was the father of Uzziah (1 Chr.xxi.1ff). Thus, there are four kings missing from the Matthaean genealogy.

3. Ernst Lohmeyer also perceives in these two references to brothers a recollection of the past history of Israel, Das Evangelium des Matthäus, edited by Werner Schmauch ("Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament," founded by H. A. W. Meyer; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 4.

which stands at the very head of an account of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection; for in recalling the long history of Israel which Jesus as the Christ fulfills (i.1-17), this table points beyond itself to the story of the one who fulfills that history (i.18-xxviii.20).

Secondly, the Matthaean genealogy suggests that unusual circumstances surround the birth of Jesus.[1] This is suggested primarily by the reference to the relationship among Joseph, Mary, and Jesus: and Jacob was the father of (= ἐγέννησεν) Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born (= ἐγεννήθη) Jesus who is called Christ (vs.16). Following the consistent use of the active verbal form throughout the genealogy (vss.2-16a), the passive form (vs.16b) intimates that Jesus' birth is somewhat different from the previous births listed in the table of descent. Furthermore, the mention of the four women among Jesus' forebears also suggests that unusual circumstances surround his birth: Tamar (vs.3), Rahab (vs.5), Ruth (vs.5), and the wife of Uriah (vs.6). Insofar as the Jews reckon legal descent and inheritance rights through the male members of the family, women are seldom named in their genealogical lists.[2] Occasionally, however, women are included in genealogies when an irregularity in the descent exists or where something noteworthy is connected with the women.[3] Several specific suggestions have been made as to the common denominator among these four women, including their sinfulness and their non-Israelite extraction.[4] Yet in the light of first-century Jewish and Christian

---

1. See the discussion by Vincent Taylor, Virgin Birth, pp. 89-90.

2. Num.xxvii.11.

3. S-B, I, 15. For example, I Chr.ii.21, 24, 34, 48ff; vii.24. The Lucan list of Jesus' ancestors follows the customary Jewish practice of excluding women from the genealogy--even Mary!

4. Those who focus upon the wickedness and/or foreign origin of these four women include the following: Alfred Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew (London: Robert Scott, 1911), pp. 2-3; Julius Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus ("Das Neue Testament Deutsch"; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950), pp. 10-11.

reflection upon these women, it is difficult to establish such a common denominator.[1] Tamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba are guilty of gross sins of a sexual nature; but such is not the case with Ruth. Rahab and Ruth are clearly non-Israelites; but such is not so obvious with regard to Tamar and Bathsheba. So the characteristic shared by these OT figures must be stated in more general terms: each woman, albeit in her own way, enters and continues the royal-messianic line of descent under unusual circumstances.[2] They also have this in common with Mary the mother of Jesus. For this reason Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the wife of Uriah are included in Jesus' ancestral list

---

1. This reflection may be summarized in the following manner: according to the OT narrative in Genesis, Tamar disguised as a harlot tricked her father-in-law Judah into having sexual intercourse with her (Gen.xxxiii). Elsewhere in the OT, however, she is remembered without reproach and even with praise (1 Chr.ii.4; Ruth iv.12). The Rabbis likewise tended to excuse Tamar and Judah for their sinful deed, S-B, I, 15-18. And Philo views her as something of a type of virtue and even of chastity. J. W. Earp, "Index of Names," Philo (10 vols. and 2 supp. vols.; "The Loeb Classical Library"; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), X, 427. In the OT Rahab is a harlot of Jericho who aids the two Israelite spies in their escape from that city's king (Josh.ii.1-21, vi.15-27). Josephus retells the story with a certain amount of faithfulness (Ant.V.i.2, 7); but the Rabbis marry her to Joshua and extol her as a type of the proselyte, S-B, I, 20-23. The NT praises Rahab for her faith and for her good works (Heb.xi.31; James ii.25). The OT presents Ruth as the Moabitess who becomes an ancestress of David through her marriage to Boaz (Ruth i.1ff). Josephus stresses her lowly estate rather than her foreign origin (Ant.V.ix.1-4). But the Rabbis are interested in her foreign background and acclaim her as a type of the proselyte; and they view her as an ancestress of the Messiah, S-B, I, 23-27. Both the OT and Josephus portray Bathsheba the wife of Uriah as an adultress (1 Sam.xi.2ff; Ant.VII.vii.1-4). The Rabbis, however, tend to minimize this failing, S-B, I, 28-29.

2. Similarly, Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 5-6; Floyd V. Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries"; New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960), p. 52; and Krister Stendahl, "Matthew," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1962), p. 771.

rather than the four mothers of Israel--Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah.[1] So as extraordinary circumstances attended the entry of these four women into the royal-messianic line of descent, such is even more the case with regard to the entry of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ (vs.16b). These cryptic allusions to the unusual circumstances which surround Jesus' birth are quite appropriate in a genealogy which precedes the account of Jesus' virginal conception and birth (vss.18-25). In this way, the genealogy points beyond itself to the narrative of that marvelous happening.

So both the salvation-history character of the genealogy and its anticipation of the unusual birth suggest that this list of Jesus' forebears was compiled with a view toward its placement at the head of the Gospel immediately prior to the story of the virgin birth. This means, quite simply, that whatever its immediate sources the genealogy achieved its present form at the hands of the First Evangelist and thus never circulated apart from the Gospel in anything like its present form. The majority opinion among Matthaean scholars upholds this view.[2]

Although any attempt to reconstruct the source or sources reworked by the First Evangelist is extremely hazardous, there is no reason to doubt that he had access to a written table of some kind.[3] That he would have received the table in documentary rather than oral form is suggested by the nature of the material itself--a lengthy list of names. Such a document would

---

1. Among the Rabbis these four women, and occasionally Eve, are honored as the mothers of Israel, S-B, I, 29-30.

2. Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 52; Allen, Matthew, p. 2; Paul Gaechter, Das Matthäus Evangelium (Innsbruch-Wien-München: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963), p. 34; Pierre Bonnard, L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu ("Commentaire du Nouveau Testament"; Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestle, 1963), p. 15; Sherman Johnson, Matthew (12 vols.; "The Interpreter's Bible"; New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951), VII, 250; M. -J. Lagrange, Évangile selon Saint Matthieu (8th ed.; "Études Bibliques"; Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1948), p. 3.

3. See James L. Price, Interpreting the New Testament (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961), p. 170.

certainly carry Jesus' line of descent back as far as David. The Lucan and the Matthaean tables of Jesus' family ties differ greatly from one another; yet both include David among his ancestors and thus intimate that the establishment of Jesus' Davidic lineage, that is his messiahship, constituted one of the principal motives behind their original composition. So Reginald Fuller may be correct when he states: "The genealogies in Matthew and Luke . . . differ in many respects, but they agree in tracing Jesus' descent through David. Probably this is as far as they originally went, and the extensions in Matthew and Luke to Abraham and Adam respectively are reflections of the Evangelists' own theologies."[1] This is consonant with the aforementioned thesis that both the salvation-history character of the Matthaean genealogy and its allusions to the unusual birth betray the redactional activity of the First Evangelist.

If the genealogy underlying the Matthaean table did in fact originally go only as far back as David, it may well have been the product of early Palestinian Jewish Christianity, which commonly affirmed Jesus' Davidic descent.[2] But the strong LXX cast of the genealogy in its present form in St. Matthew suggests that the original Palestinian Jewish Christian list took on its Matthaean garb in a Hellenistic Christian milieu, possibly a Hellenistic Jewish Christian milieu insofar as the salvation-history interest focuses upon Abraham as well as David.[3]

---

1. The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 163.

2. Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," 83; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 242-51. In this regard, see Reginald Fuller's demonstration of an "original Palestinian formula" behind Rom.i.3ff, NT Christology, pp. 165ff, 187ff.

3. Certain Rabbinic sources consider Abraham and David as the chief figures in the long genealogy of Israel, S-B, I, 13-14.

The introductory formulas and the OT citations (i.22-23; ii.5b-c, 15b-c, 17-18, 23b-c; iv.14-16; viii.17;xii.17-21;xiii.35; xxi.4-5; xxvii.9-10). The question as to the origin of the five introductory formula-OT citation clusters of Matthew i-ii is bound up with the question as to the origin of the six similar aggregates found elsewhere in the Gospel. As noted earlier these eleven OT quotations with their fulfilment formulas constitute a special class of Matthaean OT quotations--the "Reflexionszitate" or the formula quotations.

Although the introductory formulas and the OT citations are closely related to one another in their Gospel setting, they do not necessarily emanate from the same source; therefore, initially each should be considered apart from the other. Since the OT quotations could circulate without the introductory formulas, but not vice versa, they are considered first.

The ultimate source for the OT citations, of course, is the OT.[1] But does the First Evangelist quote directly from the OT itself or does he draw upon some kind of source which already contained these quotations? Are the formula quotations of Matthaean or pre-Matthaean origin? With these questions one of the great unsolved problems of NT scholarship comes to the fore. Werner Georg Kümmel correctly assesses the situation when he declares that this area of inquiry is "unusually controversial."[2] But the question persists: are the formula quotations of Matthaean or pre-Matthaean origin? Scholarly support has been given to each of these possibilities.

Firstly, these unique citations have been attributed to a pre-

---

1. That enigmatic "Nazarene" citation (ii.23b-c) constitutes something of an exception to this statement.

2. Introduction to the New Testament, founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, translated by A. J. Matill, Jr. from the 14th revised edition (New York-Nashville: Abingdom Press, 1965), p. 78. Hereafter cited as Kümmel (Feine-Behm), Introduction to NT.

Matthaean source, or sources. Traditionally this position has enjoyed the greatest currency; yet the proposals as to the precise nature of this source have been as numerous and varied as those who have ventured an opinion. Some hold that this source reached the First Evangelist in written form,[1] others that it was transmitted to him orally.[2] Usually this source has been viewed as some kind of collection of OT citations.[3] Such scholars as Bertil Gärtner have pointed to the missionary preaching tradition of the early Church as the origin and source of the OT citations; for over against the non-Christians the Christian heralds would have appealed to the OT to establish Jesus' Messiah-

---

1. These include: Bacon, Studies in Matthew, p. 507; T. H. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew ("The Moffatt New Testament Commentary"; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1928), p. xvi; and Georg Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 83; also see the discussion in Price, Interpreting NT, pp. 169-170, 191.

2. These include: Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 57; and, guardedly, W. L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, edited by H. Chadwick (2 vols.; Cambridge: The University Press, 1957), II, 127.

3. For a brief survey of the so-called Testimony-Book or Testimony-Collection hypothesis as it relates to the problem of the origin of the Matthaean formula citations, consult Stendahl, SSM, pp. 207-17. In his celebrated statement about the Apostle Matthew, Papias states: "Now Matthew collected the oracles (= τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he was able" (Eus.h.e. III.xxxix.16). Although the idea of OT Testimony-Collections is usually associated with the name of Rendel Harris, it was F. C. Burkitt who suggested that specifically the Matthaean formula quotations may be the remnants of τὰ λόγια. If this were true, the apparent influence of the Hebrew text in the formula quotations would be accounted for. Burkitt shies away from an actual commitment to this possibility; but he does conclude that the Semitic coloring of the formula citations probably stems from their derivation from a Testimony-Collection which was dependent upon the Hebrew text. Burkitt's views in this regard are reported in his The Gospel History and Its Transmission (2nd ed.: Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), pp. 124-28. One of the chief dissenters from this Testimony-Collection hypothesis is Bacon, Studies in Matthew, pp. 145-64, 500ff. Carrying the documentary hypothesis to the extreme, Bacon perceives behind the formula citations a written source which also delivered up to the First Evangelist the birth narratives, the Petrine supplements, and the legendary additions to the Passion account. This source "N" (the Nazarene Targum) is an Aramaic Targum of St. Mark which originated among the Jewish-Christians in the Syrian hinterland.

ship.[1] But others such as G. D. Kilpatrick have suggested a non-missionary preaching tradition as the source of these OT citations; for within the setting of Christian worship the preachers would have expounded the OT as having been fulfilled in the events of Jesus' life.[2] A large segment of scholarly opinion, therefore, attributes the formula citations to a pre-Matthaean source. In spite of the many differences among those who hold this view, there is a certain amount of agreement as to why they hold it: the non-LXX character of the formula quotations! G. D. Kilpatrick expresses the sentiment of the group when he says: "In any case the conclusion is clear that, because the evangelist was himself dependent upon the LXX, he must have taken over these quotations from another source which was not so dependent."[3] Yet not everyone has been led to this conclusion by the non-LXX character of the formula citations.

Secondly, these unique citations have been attributed to the work of the First Evangelist himself. Although he was not without forerunners it was Krister Stendahl who opened up exciting new possibilities for understanding

---

1. "DSH and Matthew," p. 24. Werner Georg Kümmel concurs with Gärtner in this judgment, (Feine-Behm), Introduction to NT, p. 79.

2. Origins, p. 95. Kilpatrick's basic thesis is that the Gospel of St. Matthew is a revised lectionary. Supposedly within the community in which St. Matthew was compiled the Gospel of St. Mark as well as the documents Q and M (discourse material peculiar to St. Matthew) had been read in public worship for some years. Certain sections of these documents may have been read regularly in concert with certain appropriate OT (LXX) passages. Also, certain sections of these documents would have been expounded in sermons. In such exposition, stock OT (rather than necessarily LXX) citations would be used. Finally, it was undertaken to incorporate all this material into one volume. That volume is the present Gospel of St. Matthew. Thus the OT citations in the present Gospel which keep close to the LXX probably reflect their lectionary background; and the OT citations which depart from the LXX (particularly the formula quotations) probably reflect their homiletical usage. So Krister Stendahl correctly notes that "here Kilpatrick combines his homiletic-liturgical view of Matthew with the hypothesis of testimonies," SSM, p. 205.

3. Origins, p. 57.

the formula citations as Matthaean in origin.[1] With his The School of St. Matthew, he claims that the formula citations represent the finished products of a careful exegetical procedure carried on by the First Evangelist and, more accurately, the School of which he was a member.[2] The importance of Stendahl's labor in this regard cannot be overstressed; for it seems that if he has not made his case for the Matthaean origin of the formula quotations, one must revert to the supposition that they are of pre-Matthaean origin.[3]

Still the question persists: are the formula citations of Matthaean or

---

1. Among Stendahl's most significant predecessors was Sherman Johnson, "The Biblical Quotations in Matthew," HTR, XXXVI (1943), 135-53. According to Johnson, the formula citations are memory citations made on the spot from the Hebrew text by the First Evangelist; and in his quotation from memory, the Evangelist follows an exegetical tradition sometimes akin to the LXX and sometimes akin to the later Theodotion Greek version. Unlike Stendahl, who has the advantage of the Qumran finds, Johnson does not view the formula citations as the finished products of a "School" exegesis. Nonetheless, his stress upon the Evangelist's first-hand acquaintance with the Hebrew text as well as his familiarity with certain exegetical traditions is strikingly similar to Stendahl's later position.

2. The thesis of Krister Stendahl has been sketched in some detail in the preceding definition of the formula citations as representing a particular kind of OT citation, pp. 36-38.

3. Stendahl's thesis of the formula quotations' "School" origin has by no means swept the field. Generally his critics are of two kinds. On the one hand, there are those who deny the "School" origin of the formula citations but affirm their origin with the First Evangelist himself. These include: John J. O'Rourke, "The Fulfilment Texts in Matthew," CBQ, XXIV (1962), 394-403; and Norman Hillyer, "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," EvQ, XXXVI (1964), 12-26. One might also mention the students of Günther Bornkamm who have rigorously applied the redaktionsgeschichtlich method to the Gospel of St. Matthew. Both Gerhard Barth and Heinz Joachim Held tend to view the formula citations as products of the redactional activity of the First Evangelist. See their essays in Tradition and Interpretation. On the other hand, there are those who deny not only the Matthaean "School" origin of the formula citations but also their Matthaean origin. The studies which consider Stendahl's thesis at some length include: Gärtner, "DSH and Matthew," pp. 1-24; Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, pp. 49-85; and Lindars, NT Apologetic, in particular, pp. 13-16.

pre-Matthaean origin? Several considerations suggest that the formula citations are of neither Matthaean nor Matthaean "School" origin and thus are probably of pre-Matthaean origin.

Firstly, although it is clear that the First Evangelist has reworked his narrative material in the light of the formula citations,[1] it is by no means self-evident that he has carefully formulated the texts of the OT quotations in the light of their narrative settings. Stendahl has made a rather strong case for the view that the formula citations are interpretative OT quotations. They do in part owe their peculiar textual forms to the interaction between themselves and the events of Jesus' life.[2] To establish his thesis that these formula quotations are Matthaean interpretative texts and not simply Christian (that is, pre-Matthaean) interpretative texts, however, Stendahl needs to demonstrate more conclusively than he has that the formula quotations have achieved their present textual forms under the influence of the specific narrative settings into which they have been inserted and not simply under the influence of a general christological interest. For instance, such quotations as Micah v.2 (= Mt.ii.6), Isa.liii.4 (= Mt.ii.17), Ps.lxxviii.2 (= Mt.xiii.35), and Zech.ix.9 (= Mt.xxi.5) do not depend upon their present contexts for their textual forms. In particular, the citation from Ps.lxxviii.2 suggests that the First Evangelist is not the one primarily responsible for texts of the formula quotations. The Evangelist uses this OT verse as a commentary upon Jesus' teaching in parables:"I will open my mouth

---

1. This can be easily established by an examination of the way the First Evangelist has reworked his Marcan source around five of the formula citations: Isa.ix.1-2 (= Mt.iv.15-16); Isa.liii.4 (= Mt.viii.17); Isa.xlii.1-4 (= Mt.xii. 18-21); Ps.lxxviii.2 (= Mt.xiii.35); and Isa.lxii.11-Zech.ix.9 (= Mt.xxi.5).

2. See above pp. 35-41.

in parables, I will utter what has been hidden (= ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα) since the foundation of the world." The I will utter what has been hidden differs from the MT's "I will utter riddles (= אַבִּיעָה חִידוֹת)." Noting the different readings, Stendahl suggests that " ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα is an intentional interpretation of the Hebrew text in connection with Matthew's context, by which the parables as signs of the Messiah are accentuated (cf. Mk 4 22 and parallels)."[1] This may be an intentional interpretation of the Hebrew text; but it is questionable whether or not it has been shaped under the influence of the narrative material into which the First Evangelist has inserted it. Stendahl points to Mk.iv.22 as containing the same understanding as the Matthaean formula citation: "For there is nothing hid (= κρυπτόν) except to be made manifest." In his editing of the Marcan parable discourse, however, the First Evangelist deletes this saying so that it doesn't even appear in the Matthaean parable discourse. Contrary to Stendahl, the ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα is not an intentional interpretation of the Hebrew text in the light of the Matthaean setting; and according to his view that the formula citations are of Matthaean origin, the First Evangelist here has shaped a textual reading that is more in keeping with the Marcan context than his own.

Secondly, in his use of the formula quotations, the First Evangelist does not seem particularly interested in the textual and theological subtleties involved in the kind of scholarly procedure suggested by Stendahl. In fact, his interest in the formula citations apparently lies in another direction. Critics of Stendahl have noted this; and Barnabas Lindars describes the Evangelist's interest as "pictorial."[2] This is indicated by the Evangelist's

---

1. SSM, pp. 116-17.

2. NT Apologetic, p. 198.

removal from the parable discourse of a saying which would have appropriately found its fulfilment in the appended OT citation. To the Evangelist the link between the narrative context and the quotation resided primarily in the catchword parables (= παραβολαῖς) which was present both in the narrative framework and in the OT quotation (Mt.xiii.34=Mk.iv.33; Mt.xiii.35=Ps.lxxviii.2). Similarly, catchwords bind most of the formula citations to their narrative setting: Bethlehem (Micah v.2=Mt.ii.6), Egypt (Hos.xi.1=Mt.ii.15c), Galilee, Zebulun, and Naphtali (Isa.ix.1-2=Mt.iv.15-16) diseases (Isa.liii.4=Mt.viii.17b), an ass and a colt (Zech.ix.9=Mt.xxi.5), thirty pieces of silver and the potter's field (Zech.xi.12-13=Mt.xxvii.9b-10).[1] Thus the correspondence between the OT quotations and the events of Jesus' life is viewed chiefly in terms of concrete places and specific things. So the Evangelist's interest in the formula citations is pictorial insofar as the words of OT prophecy anticipate the concrete details of Jesus' life.

Thirdly, outside the formula citations there is little evidence that the First Evangelist was familiar with all the textual traditions credited to him and his School by Stendahl's thesis. As Stendahl himself observes, elsewhere in the Gospel the LXX reigns supreme.[2] The genealogy, the composition of the First Evangelist himself, is LXX both in its superscription and in the forms of the names. Allusions in Mt.i-ii presuppose the LXX (Mt.ii.20, perhaps 23). Non-formula citations peculiar to St. Matthew reflect a LXX text type. Furthermore, OT citations which the First Evangelist has taken over from St. Mark are often brought into closer agreement with the LXX. So

---

1. In particular, note the way in which the First Evangelist has borrowed such catchwords as Zebulun and Naphtali or an ass and a colt from the OT citations and worked them into an originally Marcan context which did not contain them.

2. SSM, pp. 135ff, 147ff, 150ff.

there should be little surprise that scholars claim the non-LXX character of the formula citations as evidence for their pre-Matthaean origin.

Fourthly, the Evangelist's vocabulary does not appear to be predominant in the formula citations. More than anyone else, Georg Strecker has examined these OT quotations with an eye open for characteristically Matthaean words. Generally he has found them wanting.[1] Both the nature (OT quotations) and the extent (eleven usually terse oracles) of the material limits the conclusiveness of such a linguistic investigation; yet at one point in particular there is the striking absence of a Matthaean word precisely where one would expect it--if the formula citations are of Matthaean origin! In Mt.viii.17b, the citation from Isa.liii.4 reads: He took our infirmities and bore our diseases (= αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν). Textually, this verse follows the MT rather than the LXX.[2] Relative to the form of the Matthaean text, Stendahl observes that "Matthew's νόσους and βαστάζειν are likewise not found in the LXX style of translating, but they correspond to Matthew's phraseology."[3] Heinz Joachim Held advances this discussion another step when he declares that "the concept νόσος occurs in the whole Gospel only in the closer environs of Matt. 8.18 and here it is concentrated: Matt.4.23, 24; 9.35 and 10.1."[4] Furthermore, insofar as "all these passages are clearly summary reports which Matthew himself has formulated or (in 10.1) expanded by an expression of his own,"

---

1. Weg der Gerechtigkeit, pp. 49-85.

2. LXX: οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται; but MT: אֲכֵן חֳלָיֵנוּ הוּא נָשָׂא וּמַכְאֹבֵינוּ סְבָלָם

3. SSM, p. 107.

4. "Miracle Stories," p. 259.

Held concludes that "it not only follows that the translation νόσος in Matt. 8.17 agrees with the linguistic usage of the Evangelist, but it can also be seen that this translation fits in with his editorial and theological intentions."[1] Admittedly νόσος is a characteristically Matthaean word. What is significant in this verse is not so much the presence of νόσους in the second half of the verse but the absence of μαλακίας in the initial half. Instead, the first half of the verse has ἀσθενείας--a hapax legomenon in St. Matthew. This is of importance because in each of the summary reports mentioned by Held, the First Evangelist parallels νόσος with μαλακία (Mt.iv.23-24; ix.35; x.1). Furthermore, since μαλακία and ἀσθένεια are synonyms, the First Evangelist could easily have adopted the former for his translation of the Isaianic oracle. Such considerations of vocabulary point in the direction of a pre-Matthaean origin for the formula citations.

In conclusion, there are certain oddities concerning the formula citations which can best be explained if the quotations are pre-Matthaean in origin. For instance, the quotation from Zech.xi.12-13 (=Mt.xxvii.9b-10) is wrongly attributed to Jeremiah in the formula (Mt.xxvii.9a).[2] As is widely recognized, a long and complicated literary history underlies the Judas pericope and this formula citation with which it ends.[3] Other texts such as

---

1. "Miracle Stories," pp. 259-60.

2. At least since the time of Origen, scholars have occasionally suggested that this quotation is derived from a no longer extant apocryphal book of Jeremiah. Recently, Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, p. 82, and Gaechter, Matthäus, p. 901. The basic reason for such a proposal is the vast difference between the formula citation and any known text of Zech.xi.12-13. But Stendahl has convincingly demonstrated that virtually every word and phrase in the Matthaean citation can be correlated with a corresponding word or phrase in the MT, SSM, pp. 125-26.

3. So Lindars, NT Apologetic, p. 119, Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 394, and Filson, Matthew, p. 288.

Jer.xxxii.6-15, xviii.2-3, have played a formative role in the shaping of both the Judas story and the textual form of the OT citation. Because of the influence of such passages from Jeremiah, the reason for the attribution of the quotation to that prophet is evident. But it is questionable whether the skilled exegete who carefully created this citation would be guilty of what Stendahl calls a "confusion of memory."[1] Such is not impossible; but the wrong attribution is more readily understandable if the formula quotation and the introductory formula emanate from different sources, that is if the formula citation is pre-Matthaean.[2] Again, in his famous exegesis of Zech. ix.9 (=Mt.xxi.5), the First Evangelist understands the parallelism of the last line to be referring to two different animals: . . . upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass. Textually, this verse preserves a literal rendering of the MT.[3] This quotation is inserted into the Marcan pericope of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Mt.xxi.1-9=Mk.xi.1-10). The Marcan narrative speaks of only one animal, a colt (Mk.xi.2,4,5,7). But the First Evangelist reworks the narrative material in the light of his understanding of the formula citation. So the Matthaean narrative mentions both an ass and a colt (Mt.xxi.2, 7). Jesus, therefore, equals any circus feat by entering Jerusalem mounted upon both animals (Mt.xxi.7). Here there is no reciprocal influence between the (Marcan) narrative context and the fulfilment citation. The influence is one-way! From quotation to narrative! If the First Evangelist

---

1. SSM, p. 123.

2. For the suggestion that both quotation and the wrong ascription are pre-Matthaean, see Lindars, NT Apologetic, p. 119.

3. עַל־חֲמוֹר וְעַל עַיִר בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת ; but compare, LXX; ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον.

adopts appropriate textual forms, why does he not accept a reading which is in keeping with the Marcan story into which it is inserted? Or, at least, why does he not exegete the reading he has adopted in accordance with the Marcan account? Perhaps recognizing the difficulty this formula citation and the Matthaean interpretation of it presents for his thesis, Stendahl suggests that the Evangelist knew a tradition of two asses which did not originate with himself.[1] This means that in his selection of the textual form of Zech.ix.9 and in his application of it to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the First Evangelist is guided by a non-Marcan, pre-Matthaean tradition.[2] The more plausible solution to the problem, however, is the one most frequently offered. The quotation is pre-Matthaean; and the Evangelist misunderstood its parallelism.[3]

The above considerations make it probable that the Matthaean formula citations are of neither Matthaean nor Matthaean "School" origin. The death of Stendahl's thesis, therefore, resurrects the traditional claim that the formula citations are of pre-Matthaean origin.

---

1. SSM, p. 119.

2. The Matthaean exegesis of Zech.ix.9 has no known precedent. The Rabbis did interpret this Zechariah passage messianically; but they did not portray the Messiah coming to Zion mounted upon two animals, S-B, I, 842-44.

3. Those who suggest a misunderstanding on the part of the Evangelist include: Filson, Matthew, p. 220; Robinson, Matthew, p. 171; Plummer, Matthew, p. 285; Gerhard Barth, "Law," p. 129. Others, however, claim that the Evangelist's interpretation of the Zechariah passage is prompted by the Marcan stress upon the newness of the colt (Mk.xi.2). Supposedly this Marcan notation raises the question: if the colt has never been ridden, can his mother be far behind? So the Matthaean narrative makes explicit that implied by the Marcan narrative. Those holding this view include: Lindars, NT Apologetic, p. 114; Gaechter, Matthäus, p. 657. Against this is the fact that in his reworking of the Marcan narrative, the First Evangelist deletes the Marcan mention of the colt's newness (Mk.xi.2).

To turn from a general recognition of the pre-Matthaean origin of the formula citations to a precise delineation of their source, however, is to turn from a cleared path to a bramble thicket. Yet W. G. Kümmel appears essentially correct in his assertion that "these quotations do not point to a written or to a continuous oral source, which Matthew used in addition to Mark and Q."[1] Viewed over against the other OT quotations in the Gospel, the formula citations present something of a united front. They are prefaced with similar formulas. They preserve a non-LXX text. But viewed in relationship to one another, the formula citations display great diversity. Behind this diversity, it is difficult to detect either a written source or a continuous oral source. Literarily, they are affixed to quite different narrative settings. Five are connected to the birth traditions which, to anticipate a point, probably reached the Evangelist in oral form. Five have been inserted by the Evangelist into his Marcan source. The other quotation is combined with the Judas story which also probably reached the Evangelist in oral form; and as intimated above this citation and the Judas tradition have shared a rather long pre-Matthaean history together. Thematically, some of the formula citations are comments upon such general features of Jesus' ministry as his healing activity and his teaching in parables. But others interpret such non-recurring events as the virgin birth, the birth at Bethlehem, the return to Egypt, the slaughter of the children, the withdrawal to Nazareth, the entry into Jerusalem, and the betrayal of Judas. These diverse features of the formula citations support Kümmel's contention that they are not to be attributed to a written or to a continuous oral source.

---

1. (Feine-Behm), Introduction to NT, p. 79; also see Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, 126-27. One of the most recent proponents of a continuous written source is Georg Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, p. 83. To this source he attributes all the formula citations with the exception of the citation in Mt.ii.23 and the quotation in the Judas pericope at Mt.xxvii.9b-10. He admits, however, that little can be said of the nature of this source. He simply calls it a collection of prophetic sayings.

Perhaps the suggestions of Bertil Gärtner and G. D. Kilpatrick relative to the formula citations offer a basis for a tentative solution to the problem of their source or sources. Gärtner focuses upon the missionary situation of the early Church as their place of origin. Kilpatrick stresses Christian worship as their more immediate Sitz im Leben. But both agree in attributing them to an oral tradition of quotations which were used homiletically. Perhaps their literary history may be sketched in this manner: the formula citations originally belonged to a tradition of OT citations which were used in the missionary preaching of the early Church to confirm the messiahship of Jesus.[1] This tradition has its roots in Palestinian Jewish Christianity insofar as the formula citations show a dependence upon the Hebrew text. Such quotations, however, would not necessarily be restricted to usage in missionary preaching to non-believers. There is no reason to doubt that they might be used homiletically within the Christian communities themselves. From such usage the formula citations passed into the Gospel of St. Matthew. This need not have taken place along the precise lines proposed by Kilpatrick.[2] But from their homiletical usage in the community to which the First Evangelist belonged, they would have been familiar to him when he undertook his revision of the Gospel of St. Mark. The peculiar text of the formula citations, therefore, is attributable to their origin in the missionary preaching tradition with its roots in Palestinian Jewish Christianity and to their long history of homiletical usage; for in such an employment of the citations their interpretation

---

1. In his NT Apologetic, Barnabas Lindars applies the form-critical method to the OT citations in the NT in an attempt to uncover the different stages of interpretation through which they have passed. His index may be consulted for the pages on which he discusses the different formula citations. He moves from the pictorial usage of these quotations in the Matthaean text to the apologetic usage of them in early Christianity.

2. For an outline of Kilpatrick's proposal in this regard, consult p. 51, n. 2.

would influence the form of their text.

The formula citations, therefore, are pre-Matthaean in origin. But what about the formulas with which they are introduced? Are they also pre-Matthaean?

Those who accept the pre-Matthaean origin of the formula citations usually assume that these citations were transmitted to the First Evangelist with the introductory formulas affixed.[1] So W. L. Knox is of the opinion that "it is to be presumed that the introductory formula became stereotyped at a fairly early stage, though it is possible that Matthew has introduced it where he did not find it in his sources."[2]

But Georg Strecker, one who accepts the pre-Matthaean origin of the formula citations, has cogently argued that the introductory statements have been coined by the First Evangelist himself.[3] To buttress his claim Strecker makes three observations. Firstly, πληρόω appears outside of the formula citations in several passages which are peculiar to St. Matthew (iii.15; v.17; and xiii.48; xxiii.32.). Secondly, one introductory formula (i.22; compare xxi.4) begins with τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν , an expression which Mt.xxvi.56 proves to be the property of the Evangelist himself. Thirdly, the aorist ῥηθέν is typically Matthaean insofar as it is attested over against St. Mark in Mt.iii.3 (=Mk.i.2) and Mt.xxiv.15 (=Mk.xiii.14). In fact, this aorist passive is attested some nineteen times for St. Matthew and not once

---

1. These include: Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 93; and Bacon, Studies in Matthew, p. 470.

2. Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 127.

3. Weg der Gerechtigkeit, p. 50. W. G. Kümmel finds Strecker's argument in this regard quite convincing, (Feine-Behm), Introduction to NT, p. 79. Also see Johnson, "Biblical Quotations in Matthew," p. 137.

for the other gospels. As additional linguistic evidence in support of the Matthaean composition of the fulfilment formulas one might also note the presence of τότε in two of them (Mt.ii.17; xxvii.9a). Appearing in St. Matthew some ninety-one times, this temporal adverb stands in St. Mark six times and in St. Luke fifteen times.[1]

Strecker has made a strong case for the Matthaean composition of the fulfilment formulas. Yet this composition did not take place in a vacuum.[2] On the one hand, the Gospel of St. Mark itself contains a saying of Jesus in which the verb πληρόω is used with reference to the fulfilment of scriptures (Mk.xiv.49). Literarily independent of St. Matthew, the Gospel of St. John also preserves fulfilment formulas. On the other hand, much of the overall pattern of the Matthaean formulas has a close parallel in Rabbinic writings. So although these introductory formulas are of Matthaean composition, they were not composed ex nihilo; and one cannot discount the possibility that the First Evangelist was acquainted with introductory formulas which exhibited a pattern similar to that later assumed by his fulfilment formulas.

The extent to which the fulfilment formulas are the property of the First Evangelist can clearly be seen in his sensitivity to the appropppiateness of a given fulfilment formula for its particular context. For instance, the formulas are customarily introduced by the conjunctions ἵνα or ὅπως ("so that") to indicate purpose.[3] Yet two formulas are introduced by the temporal

---

1. Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, 124.

2. For a more detailed discussion of the background of these formulas, see pp. 31-35.

3. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, a translation and adaption of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, fourth revised and augmented edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 377, 580. Hereafter cited as Arndt-Gingrich (Bauer), Greek-English-Lexicon.

adverb τότε ("then," so Mt.ii.17; xxvii.9a). The two OT citations prefaced by these formulas are the only fulfilment citations which are not christocentric in the narrow sense of referring directly to the person and work of Jesus. The first links the account of the slaughter of the children with the Jeremiah quotation. The second binds the story of Judas' repentance and death with the Zechariah quotation. The force of the τότε rather than the ἵνα or ὅπως is to suggest that although the massacre of the infants as well as the circumstances surrounding Judas' death "then" fulfilled the scriptures, these events did not occur "in order to" fulfill the scriptures. Any suggestion that these brutal happenings resulted from Divine purpose is thereby scrupulously avoided.[1] Again, the enigmatic character of the Nazarene quotation has long been recognized (Mt.ii.23c). The OT contains no such direct quotation. But what is apparently involved here is wordplay, the juxtaposition of similar sounding words. Not only are Nazareth (= Ναζαρέθ) and Nazarene (= Ναζωραῖος)juxtaposed; but the Nazarene is a play on some OT word or passage.[2] Two features

---

1. So Plummer, Matthew, p. 18; and A. H. M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1915), p. 19.

2. But the question is which OT word or passage. The proposals made in this regard include the following: (1) Nazarene is a wordplay on the נָזִיר ("prince," "one separate," "one consecrated") of Gen.xlix.26. Here נָזִיר does not appear in the technical sense of "Nazirite." Joseph is called "prince," "one separate," or "one consecrated" among his brothers. The Nazarene of Mt.ii.23 plays on this נָזִיר and portrays Jesus as the Messiah son of Joseph. For this suggestion, see Harold Smith, " Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται ," JTS, XXVIII (1927), p. 60. (2) Nazarene is a wordplay on the נֹצְרִים ("watchmen") of Jer.xxxi.6f. The "watchmen" are those at the last day who will beckon the remnant of Israel to Zion. They are bearers of glad tidings. As the Nazarene Jesus is designated as a watchman who brings good news. Consult Eugenio Zolli, "Nazarenus Vocabitur," ZNW, XLIX (1958), 135-36. (3) Nazarene is a wordplay on the root נצר ("to guard," "protect," "preserve") frequently used in such Psalms as xii.7, xxxi.23, and xxxii.7. Yahweh is the One who "preserves" or "protects" His people. Behind the Nazarene may lie the passive participle נָצוּר ("one who is protected"); thus in his withdrawal to Galilee, to Nazareth, Jesus is the "one protected" by Yahweh from his enemies. So Gaechter, Matthäus, pp. 78-79. (4) Nazarene is a wordplay on the נֵצֶר ("shoot") of Isa.xi.1 and/or the צֶמַח ("branch") of Jer.xxiii.5, xxxiii.15, Isa.iv.2 etc. So the prophetic oracles which proclaim the emergence of a "shoot" or

of the introductory formula suggest that the Evangelist recognizes the peculiar nature of the Nazarene citation. Firstly, only here among the fulfilment formulas is the plural prophets used. This intimates that the following quotation is not simply taken over from one of the prophetic books as, for example, the quotation in Mt.ii.18 is taken over from Jeremiah. But secondly, only here among the fulfilment formulas is the word saying (= λέγοντος) omitted after the prophet. This means that although he shall be called a Nazarene was spoken through the prophets, it was not spoken through the prophets, saying, that is verbatim. The Greek participial form λέγων is often used to introduce a direct quotation;[1] and its omission here intimates that the following Nazarene quotation is a quotation in only a qualified sense. It is an indirect rather than a direct quotation.[2] So the entire verse reads,

---

"branch" out of the Davidic house find their fulfilment in Jesus. As the Nazarene Jesus is this "shoot" or "branch." Among the many who subscribe to this view are the following: Allen, Matthew, p. 17; Frank W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (New York-Nashville: Abingdom Press, 1962), p. 32; and Schniewind, Matthäus, pp. 10-11. (5) Nazarene is a wordplay on the MT נזיר ("Nazirite") and/or the LXX Ναζιραῖος ("Nazirite") in such OT passages as Judg.xiii.5, 7. Samson is such a Nazirite. As the Nazarene Jesus is draped with the mantle of the OT Nazirite. Those who hold the viewpoint include: Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 30; Eduard Schweizer, "'Er wird Nazoräer heissen' (zu Mc 1 24 Mt 2 23)," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche, pp. 90-93; and J. A. Sanders, "ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ in Matt 2 23," JBL, LXXXIV (1965), 169-72. Also see Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), pp. 83, 167.

1. Arndt-Gingrich (Bauer), Greek-English Lexicon, p. 470. Although not limited to the OT, this present active participial form is Hebraistic.

2. Following Theodor Zahn, Alfred Plummer states: "Zahn points out that there is no 'saying' (= λεγόντων)after 'Prophets,' a word which Mt. commonly inserts when he quotes a prophetical utterance. . . . The inference is that 'He shall be called a Nazarene' is not meant to be a quotation; but is the Evangelist's justification of what precedes, ὅτι means not 'that,' but 'because' or 'for': 'for he shall be called a Nazarene'." Matthew, pp. 18-19. These words are a quotation, albeit an indirect quotation. So contrary to Plummer, the ὅτι should be rendered "that." For this latter position as well as a critique of the Zahn-Plummer viewpoint, consult Allen, Matthew, p. 17.

This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophets that he shall be called a Nazarene, not "He shall be called a Nazarene." A final, example of the Evangelist's sensitivity to the appropriateness of a fulfilment formula for its particular context is seen in the absence of such a formula before the interpretative quotation from Micah v.2 (=Mt.ii.5b-6). The quotation lacks the fulfilment formula because it appears on the lips of the non-believing chief priests and scribes.

The fulfilment formulas, therefore, are so marked by linguistic characteristics typical of the First Evangelist and so carefully related to their contexts that one can speak of them as being of Matthaean origin. The possibility of the Evangelist's having been acquainted with formulas possessing a similar pattern does not preclude this judgment. These fulfilment formulas, of course, were shaped in a Hellenistic Christian milieu. Perhaps the rather striking parallel between the concluding portion (τὸ ῥηθὲν, etc.) of these Matthaean formulas and certain introductory formulas attested in Rabbinic writings indicates a Hellenistic Jewish Christian milieu. Interestingly enough, Georg Strecker who has so convincingly established the Matthaean origin of these fulfilment formulas does not note this parallel between them and the Rabbinic formulas.[1] Perhaps this is a convenience; for he is very much interested in denying the Jewish Christian origin of the Gospel.

This analysis of the introductory formulas and the OT citations may be summed up in this fashion. Of pre-Matthaean origin the fulfilment quotations are derived from neither a written nor a continuous oral source. They are derived from a tradition of quotations which were used pre-eminently in connection with Christian proclamation. Of Matthaean origin, the fulfilment formulas are the Evangelist's way of underscoring the special origin and

---

1. Weg der Gerechtigkeit, p. 50.

character of these citations.

The preceding analysis of the Matthaean formula citations and the fulfilment formulas said a great deal in general about these OT citations and introductory formulas but very little in particular about the OT citations and introductory formulas of Matthew i-ii. Yet this analysis has several important ramifications for the understanding of the literary origins of Matthew i-ii and the part played by the First Evangelist.

Firstly, insofar as the formula citations are pre-Matthaean, the texts of the OT citations in Matthew i-ii are not to be attributed to the redactional activity of the First Evangelist.[1] Therefore, the primary question is not the textual form of a particular citation but its relationship to the narrative context.[2] At the same time, however, one cannot rule out completely the possibility that the First Evangelist may have altered an OT citation at a particular point for theological or, more precisely, christological reasons. These quotations are interpretative quotations; and the First Evangelist is apparently aware of their peculiar character. He does not assimilate them to his LXX.[3] He introduces them, specifically them and no others, with his own fulfilment formula.

Secondly, insofar as the formula citations are pre-Matthaean, it is not immediately apparent whether or not the First Evangelist is the one responsible for the insertion of these quotations into the birth traditions. This question will be considered when these traditions themselves are scrutinized. Whatever the conclusion in this regard, however, one can assume that

---

1. The quotation of Mt.ii.23 constitutes the exception to this.

2. Similarly, Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, pp. 49-85.

3. Such citations as Hos.xi.1 (=Mt.ii.15c) are dependent upon their non-LXX form for their function in their Matthaean context. But such citations as Micah v.2 (=Mt.ii.6) would have made sense in their LXX form of the text.

the First Evangelist's theological concern can be ascertained from the existing relationship between these narratives and their formula citations. The extent to which he has reworked his Marcan source around the formula citations added to it offers this assurance.

Finally, insofar as the fulfilment formulas are of Matthaean origin the fulfilment formulas of Matthew are to be attributed to the redactional activity of the First Evangelist.

The narrative traditions (i.18-ii.23). Relative to the infancy traditions, G. D. Kilpatrick states: "They are independent of our three main sources Mark, Q, and M, and they constitute a large stretch of continuous narrative. Accordingly it is here, if anywhere, that we may expect to find traces of an independent written source."[1] It is difficult to say by what criteria one might conclusively establish whether or not these birth traditions were transmitted to the First Evangelist in written or in oral form. Linguistically, these narratives are couched in a vocabulary which seems typical of the Evangelist and/or his Gospel. A statistical comparison with the other synoptic gospels produces the following results: οὕτως (Mt.33, Mk. 10, Lk.21); μή with aorist subjunctive (Mt.33, Mk. 15, Lk.16); θέλειν (Mt.42, Mk.25, Lk.28); ἰδού (Mt.61, Mk.8, Lk.57); φαίνεσθαι (Mt.14, Mk.2, Lk.2); παραλαμβάνειν (Mt.16, Mk.6, Lk.7); ἕως (Mt.27, Mk.9, Lk.12); ἐγείρειν (Mt.35, Mk.18, Lk.18); προσκυνεῖν (Mt.12, Mk.2, Lk.3); συνάγειν (Mt.24, Mk.5, Lk.6); ἐπάνω (Mt.8, Mk.1, Lk.5); σφόδρα (Mt.7, Mk.1, Lk.1); προσφέρειν (Mt.15, Mk.3, Lk.4); ἀναχωρεῖν (Mt.10, Mk.1, Lk.0); ἀνοίγειν (Mt.11, Mk.1, Lk.7); ἐκεῖ (Mt.29, Mk.11, Lk.16); ἕως ἄν (Mt.9, Mk.2, Lk.3); τότε (Mt.91, Mk.6, Lk.15); τὰ μέρη (Mt.3, Mk.1, Lk.0); κατοικεῖν (Mt.4, Mk.0,

---

1. Origins, p. 51.

Lk.2).[1] But this may simply indicate that the Evangelist has reworked a documentary source as he has reworked his written Marcan source. Nonetheless, there is no compelling reason to postulate a written source for these infancy stories. Furthermore, they reflect a smooth, homogeneous style. Perhaps this intimates that the First Evangelist is committing to writing for the first time a cycle of infancy traditions known in his community. So these narrative traditions probably reached the Evangelist in oral form. The overwhelming majority of NT scholars concur with this judgment.[2]

In their Matthaean setting, the narrative traditions are arranged into some five LITERARY UNITS each of which either encloses (i.18-25, ii.1-12) or concludes with (ii.13-15, 16-18, 19-23) an introductory formula and OT citation. It now becomes necessary to penetrate behind these LITERARY UNITS to uncover the original scope of the narrative traditions therein deposited and their relationship to the introductory formulas and OT citations. The following analysis attempts to demonstrate that the Matthaean infancy narratives are derived from three basic strands of tradition--a birth story, a Magi story, and a Herod story--and that the formulas and OT citations are secondary additions to these basic strands.

The narrative material within the initial narrative LITERARY UNIT, namely Mt.i.18-25, is essentially independent of the preceding genealogy and the narrative traditions of chapter two.[3] Modeled along the lines of the OT

---

1. Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 124. Knox offers an even more comprehensive list than that above.

2. Among this majority are numbered the following: Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 55; Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 126, no. 1; Johnson, Matthew, p. 238; Allen, Matthew, p.lxi; B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1924), p. 266; Price, Interpreting NT, p. 191.

3. Form-criticism long ago established this. See both Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 291-292, and Dibelius, Tradition, p. 128.

birth stories, this self-contained story of Jesus' birth circulated apart from the other Matthaean infancy traditions. Furthermore, the Isaianic oracle with its Matthaean introductory formula (vss.22-23) is a secondary addition to the story.[1] They can be removed from the narrative without doing violence to the story. Vs. 24 does not presuppose vss.22-23; and the former points back to vss.20-21. Admittedly the language of vss.20-21 and vss.24-25 closely resembles the phraseology of Isa.vii.14:

> For the one having been conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. And she will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus . . . (vss.20-21)
>
> Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel . . . (vs.23=Isa.vii.14)
>
> . . . she had borne a son. And he called his name Jesus. (vs.25)

This juxtaposition of conceiving, bearing, and naming, however, is an idiom which is repeatedly used in the OT birth stories upon which this Matthaean narrative is modeled; therefore, the presence of this idiom in the narrative itself does not necessarily reflect the influence of the OT oracle. Furthermore, the Isaianic reference to the virgin (= ἡ παρθένος) is nowhere duplicated in the narrative portion. Therein it is assumed that Mary is a virgin, but she is not called such by name. Finally, the Lucan account of the virgin birth shows that such a reference does not depend upon Isa.vii.14[2] So the quotation from Isa.vii.14 along with its formula of introduction is a secondary addition to the account of Jesus' birth. The Matthaean story of Jesus' virginal conception and birth, therefore, offers little support for

---

1. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 291. Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, p. 55.

2. Particularly, Lk.i.26-35. It is a moot question to what extent Isa.vii.14 underlies this account. For excellent treatments of the OT substructure of the Lucan birth narratives, consult the following: René Laurentin, Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II ("Études Bibliques"; Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1957), pp. 64-79; and Max-Alain Chevallier, L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament ("Études d'Historie et de Philosophie Religieuses," 49; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958), pp. 84-91.

those who claim that this notion arose on the basis of this Isaianic oracle.[1]

The Matthaean form of the story of Jesus' virginal birth seems to represent something of a secondary stage in the development of that story; for in it the virginal conception and birth are not so much announced as assumed. G. D. Kilpatrick intimates this when he observes: "While the story presumes the virginity of Mary, its main purpose is to answer the question 'Why, if this were so, did Joseph not divorce his wife?'."[2] Behind the present form of the Matthaean story, therefore, may lie an account which originally focused more on the annunciation itself; but such cannot be recovered on the basis of the present Matthaean account. One can simply say that this Matthaean story probably achieved its present form in a Hellenistic Jewish Christian community which was already quite familiar with this miraculous event. It was no doubt within such a Hellenistic Jewish Christian milieu that the verse from Isa.vii.14 with its LXX reading of ἡ παρθένος for הָעַלְמָה was added to the story.

Rudolf Bultmann also envisions something of a two-stage development behind this Matthaean account of Jesus' birth but a development of a much more radical kind. The point of departure for his explication of this evolution is the observation that "in v.21 the name of Jesus has to be translated to make the reason for αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει κτλ. intelligible."[3] From this he infers that a Semitic report must be the basis of the Matthaean birth account. At this point his core assumption relative to the origin of the virgin birth idea

---

1. See the discussion by M'Neile, Matthew, p. 11.

2. Origins, p. 53. Also see Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind," p. 24; Stendahl, "Matthew," p. 771, and Strecker, Weg der Gerchtigkeit, pp. 53-54.

3. Synoptic Tradition, p. 291.

comes into play. To him the notion of the divine generation of a child from a virgin is completely alien to the Jewish mind;[1] therefore, he concludes that this original Semitic birth report did not contain such an idea. The two stages of development he postulates for the story are as follows: Firstly, "the old story had simply told how an angel promised Joseph that his son would be Messiah. This is supported by the fact that Joseph is expressly addressed as 'υἱὸς Δαυείδ' and that in v.21 we may well read with syr^{sc}: 'She will bear thee a son!'"[2] and secondly, the story was transformed by the addition of the virgin birth motif. "It was first added in the transformation in Hellenism, where the idea of the generation of a king or a hero from a virgin by the godhead was widespread."[3]

Bultmann, however, has not established his case for such a two-stage development of the Matthaean story of Jesus' virginal birth. It is not only virtually impossible to recover from this narrative a non-virgin birth story which merely proclaims the messianic destiny of Jesus but also unnecessary. Several considerations are relevant in this regard. Firstly, the entire pericope presupposes and is saturated with the virgin birth theme (vss.18b, 20, 23, 25). Secondly, the application of 'υἱὸς Δαυείδ', the Son of David, to Joseph is not so much a remnant from the original non-virgin birth story as an intrusion into the original virgin birth account. In fact, if there is a clear redactional touch by the First Evangelist in the body of the narrative itself, this is surely it; for the significance of Joseph as Son of David is clearly perceived only in the light of the preceding genealogy which is the

---

1. Synoptic Tradition, p. 291, n. 4.
2. Ibid., p. 292.
3. Ibid., pp. 291-292; also p. 304.

composition of the First Evangelist. Thirdly, the reading of Sy^{sc} noted by Bultmann is a literary embellishment by the Syriac scribes rather than the original reading of the Matthaean text. Fourthly, that the name Jesus is interpreted without translation does not necessarily indicate an underlying Semitic report. Even within Hellenistic circles it could have been known that the name Jesus meant "Saviour."[1] Fifthly, even if the name Jesus interpreted without translation does point to an original Semitic report, it is not impossible that the birth of Jesus described therein would have been virginal in kind. Many have repeated the dictum that the virgin birth idea could not have arisen within Palestinian Jewish Christianity because such an idea is utterly foreign to the Jewish mind.[2] But no less a student of first-century Judaism than David Daube has pointed to a passage in the Midrash which may refer to a direct generation by Yahweh--although not to a virginal conception and birth.[3] Pointing to Josephus' treatment of the Exodus in Ant.II. ix.3ff as possible confirmation of Daube's thesis, W. D. Davies replies

---

1. Similarly, Stendahl, "Quis et unde?," p. 103.

2. For a brief and incisive discussion of the problem, consult C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: S.P.C.K., 1947), pp. 5-24. According to Barrett, all alleged pagan, OT, and Philonic parallels to the Gospel narratives of the virgin birth break down at one specific point: the role played by the Holy Spirit!' It is the continued stress upon the creative activity of the Spirit of God within Hellenistic Judaism in contradistinction to Palestinian Judaism that leads him to view Hellenistic Jewish Christianity as the setting for the origin of the notion of Jesus' virginal conception and birth. Also see Otto Michel and Otto Betz, "Von Gott gezeugt," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche, pp. 3-23.

3. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: The Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 5-9. Within several Rabbinic sources the view is held that the Israelites in Egypt abstained from marital union. In commenting upon the words "our affliction" in Deut.xxvi.7, the Midrash says: "This means the abstention from sexual intercourse, as it is written (in Exodus), 'And God saw the children of Israel, and God knew.'" See Ex.ii.25. Daube suggests that the author of the Midrash understood "to know" in the sexual sense. Thus, he may have believed that since natural propagation was not possible, either the women in general or the mother of Moses in particular conceived of God himself.

specificially to Rudolf Bultmann with these words: "But his assumption that the Virgin Birth cannot have arisen on Palestinian soil is by no means certain."[1] In spite of Davies' protest, however, it must be admitted that there is only the barest thread of evidence for a Palestinian origin of the virgin birth idea. Yet support for the view that the Matthaean story of Jesus' virginal birth is indeed rooted in the soil of Palestinian Jewish Christianity does come from the accuracy with which the story depicts and alludes to Jewish customs relating to betrothal, marriage, and divorce.[2]

---

1. Sermon on the Mount, p. 63; also pp. 81f.

2. For brief sketches of Jewish practices pertaining to betrothal, marriage, and divorce, consult the following: George Foot Moore, Judaism (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30), II, 121-26; Shailer Matthews, New Testament Times in Palestine (new and revised ed.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933), pp. 192-94; and S-B, I, pp. 45ff, 303ff. These customs along with side glances at relevant Matthaean verses may be summarized in this way: among the Jews of the first century, marriage involves two distinct steps: betrothal, קִדּוּשִׁין or אֵרוּסִין, and marriage proper, נִשּׂוּאִין (vss.18, 20, 24). Often the betrothal is arranged by the parents of the parties concerned. It is usually effected by the husband-to-be's presentation to his future wife of a small coin, or an object whose value is not less than such a coin, and by his statement, oral or written, of the purpose of this presentation. With her acceptance of the coin and his declaration, they legally become husband and wife (vss.19, 20). Unfaithfulness by the woman during the betrothal is adultery (perhaps vs.19); and the termination of a betrothal requires a formal divorce (vs.19). Usually some time elapses between the betrothal and the marriage (vs.18). During this interval between betrothal and marriage proper, co-habitation of the husband and wife seems to be customary in Judea--but not in Galilee (vs.18). The marriage proper is effected when the husband takes home his betrothed wife (vss.20, 24). According to Jewish law, the right of divorce is reserved for the husband (vs.19); albeit under certain circumstances the courts could force the husband to divorce his wife. Among the Rabbis of the first century, a great debate raged as to the lawful grounds of divorce. The discussion revolved around the meaning of the phrase "some indecency" in Deut.xxiv.1: "When a man takes a wife and marries her, if then she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency in her and he writes her a bill of divorce and puts it in her hands and sends her out of his house. . . ." The school of Hillel understood indecency to allow for a number of faults as legitimate grounds; but the school of Shammai interpreted the phrase so as to allow only unchastity as a lawful reason for divorce. So both certainly agree that adultery is sufficient cause (perhaps vs.19). Generally the procedure for obtaining a divorce is of two kinds: either the husband with two witnesses presents his wife with a bill of divorce, or the husband takes his wife before a court of law for judgment (vs.19). The aforementioned Galilean practice of the couple's non-cohabitation

In conclusion, therefore, the initial narrative LITERARY UNIT, Mt.i. 18-25, is an account of Jesus' virginal birth which was shaped in a Hellenistic Jewish Christian community that was quite familiar with this marvelous happening. Within this milieu the Isaianic oracle was added to the account. The Matthaean form of the story may represent something of a secondary stage in the development of the story insofar as it assumes rather than announces the virginal birth; but such is conjecture, and the primary stage cannot be reconstructed. Similarly, it is untenable to hold that this virginal birth account represents a transformed non-virgin birth story. If the story can be traced to Palestinian Jewish Christianity, as perhaps it can, even in that setting it was a virgin birth narrative.

The four narrative LITERARY UNITS of the second chapter, namely Mt.ii. 1-12, 13-15, 16-18, 19-23, are independent of the happenings recounted in the opening narrative LITERARY UNIT, Mt.i.18-25.[1] In their Matthaean context these four narrative LITERARY UNITS comprise a rather carefully wrought narrative complex. That which lends cohesion to this series of scenes is the motif which comes to the fore in the initial episode: the antipathy of King Herod (vs.1), or the Herods, for Jesus the King of the Jews (vs.2). The Herodian fear and hatred of the child Jesus is the driving force behind the events of this chapter. This antagonism motivates the sending of the astrologers to Bethlehem (vss.1-12), causes the flight of Jesus with his family to Egypt (vss.13-15), precipitates the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem

---

prompts Ernst Lohmeyer to suggest that the origin of the Matthaean birth story is to be sought in Galilee; for this seems to be the practice presupposed by the Matthaean narrative, Matthäus, p. 12.

1. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 292. Dibelius, Tradition, p. 128.

(vss.16-18), and even prompts the final withdrawal of Jesus with his family to Nazareth of Galilee (vss.19-23). The extent of this overall coherence is further suggested by the repeated references to Herod (vss.1, 3, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 22) and the frequent mention of the astrologers (vss.1, 7, 9ff, 13, 16). The interdependence of these four LITERARY UNITS is such that not one of them can stand upon its own legs in the present Matthaean context. This means that although these four scenes in chapter two may be independent of the virgin birth episode they are not independent of one another. So not one of them circulated apart from the others in anything like its present form. Behind these four interlocking LITERARY UNITS, however, can be detected two strands of tradition which coalesced to produce the basic outline of this chapter. The spotlight now focuses upon the first of these.

Although the initial LITERARY UNIT, Mt.ii.1-12, did not circulate in its present form as a self-contained story, it seems quite likely that this section is the depository for a tradition which did so circulate--an originally independent Magi story.[1] The latter is so closely united with the Herod motif (vss.1-12) and so influential throughout the rest of the chapter (vss.13, 16) that any attempt at reconstruction is surely precarious; yet the present Matthaean text of the astrologers episode (vss.1-12) seems to preserve the profile of such. In this regard two observations are appropriate. Firstly, according to the Matthaean story, the astrologers come from the East with a stated purpose--to worship the newborn Jesus (vs.2b)! The climax of the entire scene occurs when the astrologers accomplish their purpose and worship the

---

1. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 277. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 292. Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, 122f. Dibelius, Tradition, p. 128f. Although there is general agreement as to the existence of an originally independent Magi story, there is a widespread disagreement as to the nature and scope of this story.

child with gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh (vs.11). Immediately thereafter the astrologers take leave. Secondly, the birth of Jesus is announced to the astrologers by the rising of his star (vs.1b). This same star finally leads them to him (vss.9b-10). No doubt similar considerations have prompted Ferdinand Hahn to put forward vss.1b, 2b, 9b-11, as the verses which preserve the outline of the original story:[1]

> . . . astrologers from the East came (to Jerusalem). . . . For we observed the rising of his star and have come to pay him homage. . . . And behold, the star which they had observed at its rising went before them until it came and stopped above the place where the child was. And when they saw the star, they were very glad. Entering the house, they saw the child with Mary his mother; and falling down they paid him homage. They opened their treasure chests and offeredhim gifts--gold and frankincense and myrrh.

The original story, therefore, would concern astrologers who learned of Jesus' birth by the appearance of his star and who thereupon resolved to pay him homage. Guided directly to him by this wondrous star, they honor him with their gifts.

In such a reconstruction one problem remains: the site of Jesus' birth! If the story has been influenced by the ideas of Jewish messianic/eschatological expectation whereby the pagans would journey to Zion, perhaps Jerusalem was assumed to be the place of this act of worship. But if even in its earliest form the story has been tinged with the ideas of Davidic messianism whereby the Messiah would come forth from the city of David's birth, perhaps Bethlehem was named as the place of this act of worship.

But the above reconstruction of the Magi story's bare outline does

---

1. Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 277, n. 2. That these verses do preserve the remnants of a story which was originally independent of the other traditions in chapter two is further suggested by the mention of the child with Mary his mother (vs.11). Only here in the chapter is Mary designated by name. Elsewhere the stereotyped phrase the child and his mother appears (vss.13, 14, 20, 21).

solve one problem presented by the Matthaean form of the story.[1] According to the Matthaean text, the star which proclaims the birth of Jesus to the astrologers apparently does not guide them to Jerusalem; yet suddenly it reappears on the road to Bethlehem and directs them to the very house wherein the child lies. It is peculiar that this star does not lead them directly to the child without their making something of a detour to Jerusalem. In the original story, therefore, the star does guide them directly to the child. Only with the addition of the Herod motif does it become necessary for the astrologers to make inquiry of him as to the infant's birthplace.

This original Magi story then has passed through at least two major phases of development.

Firstly, there is the story which simply reports the astrologers' visit to the newborn Jesus without any mention of Herod (so vss.1b, 2b, 9b-11). Perhaps the several motifs this primitive form of the story has in common with the eschatological/messianic speculation and haggadic lore of Palestinian Judaism point to its rootage in Palestinian Jewish Christianity. The text of St. Matthew does not allow penetration behind this initial phase to a pagan story of Arabian Magi who paid homage to the virgin goddess's son;[2] the features of the story which show kinship with Jewish ideas make such a penetration unnecessary.

Secondly, this story was united with certain traditions about Herod's antagonism toward the infant Jesus. Ferdinand Hahn suggests that the present Matthaean form of the story was not the result of a merger between the primitive

---

1. See the discussion by Vögtle, "Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," II, 250ff.

2. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 292.

Magi story and an independent tradition about Herod.[1] Rather he sees the present form of the story as a development out of the older Magi tale. This expansion is to be seen in vss.1a, 2a, 3-9a, 12. To anticipate the analysis of the final three narrative LITERARY UNITS of this chapter (vss.13-15, 16-18, 19-23), however, these scenes do bear witness to a definite tradition about Herod's hatred of Jesus; therefore the present form of the Magi narrative (vss.1-12) is probably the result of a merger between two originally independent traditions.

The introductory formula and OT citation may represent an even later insertion into this revised Magi story (vss.5b-6). Although the recourse to Scripture by the chief priests and scribes is quite appropriate in this narrative, the quotation from Micah v.2 can be removed from its narrative framework without damage to that framework; for Herod's question as to the Messiah's birthplace receives an answer before the Jewish leaders give scriptural backing to their reply. They say,"At Bethlehem of Judea"(vs.5a).

A primitive Magi story, therefore, constitutes one of the two basic strands of tradition which underlie the narrative complex of chapter two. The spotlight now shifts to the second of these traditions.

Like the opening LITERARY UNIT of chapter two, not one of concluding three LITERARY UNITS, vss.13-15, 16-18, 19-23, could have circulated in its present form apart from its Matthaean context. Unlike that introductory section, however, not one of these scenes preserves in itself a tradition which could have so circulated.[2] Nonetheless, two or more of these scenes

---

1. Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 277, n. 4.

2. The only possible exception to this is the central LITERARY UNIT, vss.16-18. Herein no explicit mention is made of either Jesus or his parents. It is not inconceivable that it originated as one of the many tales that were common in the first century about the proverbial cruelty of Herod the Great. Josephus, in particular, repeats many stories of Herod's heinous deeds. For instance, Wars, I, xvii, 1-9.

do bear a collective witness to a tradition which was originally independent of the Magi story. Form-critics such as Martin Dibelius have stressed the independence of vss.13ff from the preceding narrative material,[1] but David Daube has done more than anyone else to delineate the scope of this independent tradition.[2] To Daube vss.13-18, the story of Joseph's flight into Egypt to escape the persecution of Herod, are modeled after the Haggadah of Jacob's flight into Egypt to escape the wrath of Laban. Accordingly, this account has received its shape within Palestinian Jewish Christianity. Therefore, the two narrative LITERARY UNITS vss.13-15, 16-18, constitute the depository for the second tradition fundamental to chapter two.

This means that the final LITERARY UNIT, vss.19-23, represents an expansion of this older tradition. In fact, this expansion probably occurred in two distinct steps. Initial support for this comes from the fact that the scene has two distinct parts: the return of Joseph and his family to Israel (vss.19-21) and the further withdrawal to Nazareth of Galilee (vss.22-23). This two-fold expansion must now be viewed in some detail.

The first half of the concluding scene presupposes the account of the flight into Egypt. Furthermore, the phraseology of the former recalls the wording of the latter:

> After they had departed, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph and said, "Rise up, take the child and his mother and flee into Egypt; and remain there until I tell you. For Herod is about to search for the child in order to kill him" Rising up he took the child and his mother by night and withdrew into Egypt; and he remained there until the death of Herod. (ii.13-15a)

---

1. Tradition, pp. 129-30.

2. "Earliest Structure," pp. 184-86. A more detailed review of this thesis appears on pp. 28-29.

> When Herod died, behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt and said, "Rise up, take the child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel; for those who seek the life of the child are dead." Rising up, he took the child and his mother and entered the land of Israel. (ii.19-21)

Behind this expansion lies the assumption that what goes into Egypt must come out. More than this, however, this expansion serves to bring into sharper focus the New Exodus theme. Two features in particular accomplish this. Firstly, the land of Israel is named as the destination of Joseph and his family. Although this phrase rarely appears in the OT Penteteuchal traditions of the Exodus, it is used in such post-exilic writings as the prophetic book of Ezekiel to designate the destination of the New Exodus.[1] Secondly, these verses declare that those who seek the life of the child are dead. An obvious allusion to Ex.iv.19 (LXX) these words involve a certain typological correspondence between Moses the leader of the first Exodus and Jesus the leader of the New Exodus. So an interest in the New Exodus motif is involved in this initial expansion of vss.13-18. Perhaps the allusion to the LXX suggests that this expansion occurred within a Hellenistic Jewish Christian milieu.

The concluding portion of this final scene represents a still further development; and this second half presupposes the narration in the first half of the return to Israel:

> But having heard that Archelaus rules over Judea in place of his father Herod, he was afraid to go there. And having been warned in a dream, he withdrew into the region of Galilee; and he went and settled in a city called Nazareth. (vss.22-23a)

This addition serves to introduce Galilee, and more particularly Nazareth, as Jesus' place of residence. The language and literary style of

---

1. Ezek.xi.17; xiii.9; xx.38; xxxvii.12. Infrequent in the OT outside of Ezekiel, this phrase appears only here in the NT. Among the Rabbis, it is the standard characterization for Palestine, S-B, I, pp. 90-91.

these verses is in keeping with the language and literary style elsewhere in Matthew i-ii; but the content is strikingly different. It is just this difference that exposes these verses as an expansion which probably postdates the development witnessed in vss.19-21.[1] Elsewhere in Matthew i-ii, including vss.19ff, Joseph receives the divine behest in a dream but through the Angel of the Lord. With the assurance of divine protection, Joseph obeys with confidence. But in these concluding verses Joseph becomes quite frightened when he learns that Archelaus has replaced his father Herod the Great as ruler over Judea. On this occasion the divine command comes to him simply in a dream. So Joseph's experience more closely parallels that of the astrologers rather than his own previous experiences. In fact, the very wording of Joseph's experience recalls the wording of the astrologers' experience. Of the former as well as the latter it is said: And having been warned in a dream . . . (vss.22, 12).[2]

The OT citations with their introductory formulas (vss.15b-c, 17-18, 23b-c) may represent even later insertions into this expanded Herod story. The contents of the narrative material within these three LITERARY UNITS can be explained without recourse to the affixed OT quotations. Each of the introductory formula-OT citation clusters stands at the end of a well defined narrative section. Each of the introductory formula-OT citation clusters can be removed without injury to its narrative setting.

Behind the four LITERARY UNITS of chapter two, therefore, are two principal narrative traditions. Vss.1-12 preserve a story which portrayed

---

1. Similarly, Dibelius, Tradition, p. 129, n. 1.

2. There is a slight variation, however, in the Greek which underlies this translation: χρηματισθεὶς δὲ κατ' ὄναρ (vs.22); καὶ χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ (vs.12).

the adoration of the newborn Jesus by the Eastern Magi. Vss.13-23 enshrine a tradition of the child's persecution by Herod and his flight into Egypt with his family. It is sometimes maintained that the Magi story included some mention of Herod prior to that story's merger with the account of Herod's persecution. So Martin Dibelius refers to the Magi story in these words: "Its connection with what follows is only in the circumstance that the Herod questioned in Jerusalem by the Magi, is the same as then sought the life of the child."[1] Such also seems the implication of Ferdinand Hahn's suggestion that the presence of Herod in the Matthaean form of the Magi story is the result of an expansion of the older Magi story rather than the consequence of a merger with an independent Herod tradition.[2] It is difficult to see, however, the function of the Herod motif in a Magi story which is divorced from the account of Herod's slaughter of the children in Bethlehem. Furthermore, vss.13ff do bear witness to an independent Herod tradition. Therefore, it seems likely that the Magi story first received the Herod motif when it became associated with the persecution tradition. If this be the case, then the present Magi story (vss.1-12) achieved its essential outline in the light of the tradition of Herod's persecution of the infant Jesus.

The foregoing literary analysis of the narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii may be summarized in this way: behind the Matthaean infancy traditions lie three basic strands of tradition--a birth story, a Magi story, and a Herod story. The OT citations with their Matthaean introductory formulas are in some, as yet unspecified, sense secondary additions to these basic strands.

---

1. Tradition, p. 129,

2. Christologische Hoheitstitel, p. 277. See above pp. 77-79.

That the narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii were first committed to writing by the First Evangelist has been asserted. The resultant text of Matthew i-ii has been analyzed in order to ascertain something of the pre-literary history of these narrative traditions and the OT citations with which they are united. Now the task becomes one of deciphering the relationship among the various strands of the narrative traditions and between the narrative traditions and the OT citations as they reached the First Evangelist. Among those who affirm the pre-Matthaean oral status of these narrative traditions, some declare that the basic lines of the stories and the OT quotations were already fixed when the First Evangelist undertook to write them down.[1] Others assert that the different narrative traditions and the OT citations were first brought together and formulated into something of a unified whole by the First Evangelist himself.[2] A proper solution to the problem, however, involves a reply to three related but different questions: had the narrative traditions of chapter two already achieved something of a pre-Matthaean unity? Was the narrative tradition of chapter i.18-25 already associated with the traditions of chapter two? Were the OT citations already associated with the narrative traditions?

The overall coherence of chapter two is the result of the conflation of two fundamental traditions--a Magi story and a Herod story. This conflation was probably well advanced when the First Evangelist reduced these originally disparate traditions to writing. The rather extensive reciprocal influence between these traditions can best be explained as having taken place during the period of oral transmission. The conflation of these two traditions may

---

1. Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 55. Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, 126, n. 1.

2. Dibelius, Tradition, pp. 128-29. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 293-94.

have been initiated within the community of the First Evangelist; but it antedates his reducing these combined stories to writing. But the final wording and style perhaps along with some of the details are his.

In its Matthaean setting, the story of Jesus' birth in chapter one is essentially independent of the traditions in chapter two. It does, however, share with these traditions such motifs as the centrality of Joseph and divine communication by means of dreams and/or the Angel of the Lord. These shared characteristics prompt W. L. Knox to identify three so called Joseph stories as the original substratum of the source behind the Matthaean infancy stories (i.1-18; ii.13-15, 19-23).[1] A rigorous form-critical analysis of these chapters rules out this possibility. Furthermore, the appearance of such motifs as Joseph, dreams, and the Angel of the Lord does not so much indicate common origin as later association.[2] Thus, the story of Jesus' birth in chapter one probably did have some pre-Matthaean association with the traditions of the second chapter. Elsewhere in the First Gospel narrative material peculiar to it contains both the dream motif (xxvii.19) and the Angel of the Lord (xxviii.2). These motifs in both the infancy traditions and elsewhere in the Gospel suggest that the different strands of the oral tradition current within the community of the First Evangelist mutually influenced one another.

The OT citations along with their introductory formulas are in some sense secondary additions to the narrative traditions of Matthew i-ii. There

---

1. Synoptic Gospels, II, 122.

2. In his establishment of the parallels between Joseph's flight to Egypt in Mt.ii.13ff and Jacob's flight to Egypt in the Passover Haggadah, David Daube notes that Joseph like Jacob is warned in a dream. Unlike Jacob, however, Joseph is confronted in that dream with the Angel of the Lord. Perhaps the original account of Joseph's flight mentioned only the dream; and the addition of the Angel of the Lord was made under the influence of that Angel's appearance to Joseph in Mt.i.18ff. "Earliest Structure," pp. 184-85. See above p. 29.

is no reason to deny that these quotations were associated with these traditions before the First Evangelist reduced both the stories and the OT citations to writing. In fact, it is difficult to understand the usefulness of such quotations as Hos.xi.1 (=Mt.ii.15c) apart from their present narratives. This pre-Matthaean association is what one might expect in a community in which a rather extensive body of oral narrative material as well as certain stock quotations were in circulation. Furthermore, the Zechariah fulfilment quotation seems to have enjoyed a pre-Matthaean association with the Judas pericope to which it is joined (Mt.xxvii.3-10). But this need not minimize the crucial contribution of the First Evangelist when he committed to writing the infancy stories with their related OT citations. This contribution is of two kinds. Firstly, he prefaces the OT citations with his own characteristic fulfilment formulas. That these formulas are of Matthaean composition has been demonstrated. Secondly, he places the formula citations in the stories at the places he deems appropriate. This can be established by observing the parallels between the way in which the fulfilment citations of Matthew i-ii are related to their narrative settings and the way in which the Evangelist himself has related fulfilment citations to his Marcan narrative material. This comparison confirms that the First Evangelist is the one responsible for the specific placement of the fulfilment citations in Matthew i-ii. The quotation from Isa.vii.14 (=Mt.i.23) is situated immediately after the first mention of Jesus' conception, birth, and naming rather than after the birth and naming itself. Similarly, the quotation from Hos.xi.1 (=Mt.ii.15c) is placed immediately after the first mention of Egypt rather than after the return of Joseph and his child Jesus out of Egypt. In the pericope of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the First Evangelist has inserted the quotation from Zech.ix.9 (=Mt.xxi.5) immediately after the initial mention of that entry rather than after the entry itself. Again, the placement of the peculiar Nazarene

quotation (=Mt.ii.23c) has a striking counterpart in the First Evangelist's insertion of the quotation from Isa.ix.1-2 (Mt.iv.15-16) into the account of Jesus' first preaching in Galilee. The Nazarene quotation is affixed to what appears to be a secondary expansion of the concluding scene in the chapter. This expansion serves to introduce Nazareth of Galilee as Jesus' place of residence. So it would appear that perhaps this expansion was made with a view toward the affixing of the Nazarene quotation. In order to prepare for the insertion of the aforementioned Isaianic oracle, the First Evangelist reworks his Marcan source in the following manner:

Now when he heard that John was arrested, he withdrew into Galilee; and leaving Nazareth he went and dwelt in Capernaum by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali; that what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled: "The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, toward the sea, across the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles-- the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light, and for those who sat in the region and shadow of death light has dawned." From that time Jesus began to preach, saying, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." (Mt.iv.12-17)	Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of God, and saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel." (Mk.i. 14-15)

In the discussion at hand, the significant thing about this reworking of St. Mark by the First Evangelist is that he makes certain geographical remarks of his own. This addition serves to introduce Capernaum in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali as the new residence of Jesus. Whatever else may be

involved here,[1] the First Evangelist is certainly guided in his remarks by the appearance of Zebulun and Naphtali in the Isaianic passage. The First Evangelist's reworking of his Marcan source in this regard offers a close parallel to the kind of procedure followed in the expansion of the final scene of the birth narratives. This suggests that the First Evangelist is the one responsible for this expansion. He made it in order to have an appropriate setting for the Nazarene citation. So Martin Dibelius is correct when he declares: "verses, ii, 22f., are remarks of the evangelist who wishes to introduce Nazareth as Jesus' home."[2] The preceding comparison between the way in which the formula citations of Matthew i-ii are related to their narrative settings and the way in which the First Evangelist has related the fulfilment quotations to his Marcan source does indeed confirm that he is the one responsible for their placement in Matthew i-ii.

Before concluding this consideration of the narrative tradition in Matthew i-ii, a comment is in order about the possibilities opened up by the above comparison of Mt.ii.22-23 and Mt.iv.12-17. In particular, the results of this comparison make it likely that the Nazarene quotation is of Matthaean origin. No doubt the designation of Jesus as the Nazarene was known within the community of the First Evangelist. Perhaps this name was understood to be derived from the name of the town Nazareth. But the suggestion that the scriptures foretold of the application of this name to Jesus probably stems

---

1. The reference in Mt.iv.13 to Jesus' leaving Nazareth presents NT scholarship with something of a problem; for in the preceding narrative no mention is made of Jesus' having gone to Nazareth. So there is an apparent gap between vs.12 and vs.13. B. H. Streeter attributes this reference to Nazareth to Q, Four Gospels, pp. 206ff. G. D. Kilpatrick suggests that it is a remnant of a story of Jesus' preaching at Nazareth which was once orally associated with Mk.i.14f but later dropped out before the Matthaean revision of St. Mark, Origins pp. 93ff. Such hypotheses, however, do not affect the contention that vs.13 is essentially constructed from the Isaianic oracle.

2. Tradition, p. 129, n. 1.

from the Evangelist himself. There are no obstacles to this conclusion; and several considerations support it. Firstly, the so called Nazarene quotation is not an explicit OT citation which reflects the influence of the Hebrew text so there is no need to attribute it to the pre-Matthaean collection of stock quotations from which the other formula citations were derived. Secondly, the introductory formula is of Matthaean origin, and its wording indicates that the Evangelist was aware of the OT passage or passages upon which the name Nazarene constitutes a wordplay. Thirdly, the narrative expansion of vss.22-23a is of Matthaean origin and represents the effort by the Evangelist to shape a suitable setting for the following introductory formula-citation cluster. All of these considerations point in the direction of the Matthaean origin of the Nazarene citation. Yet one important criterion must be met. As stressed repeatedly the First Evangelist is dependent upon the LXX; therefore, if this Nazarene citation is of Matthaean origin, then the name Nazarene must constitute a wordplay upon an LXX passage. An examination of the many different proposals in this regard makes the fulfilment of this requirement appear impossible.[1] Usually it is assumed that the wordplay is upon some verse or passage in the Hebrew text. But "the most fruitful and most probable suggestions have been those which have seen in the Matthaean reference some reflection of the birth of Samson."[2] Samson is a Nazirite. How close the Ναζωραῖος of Mt.ii.23c stands to the Ναζιραῖος of Judg.xiii.5, 7 (LXX A)![3] That the Evangelist may have had this passage in mind is further

---

1. A survey of these proposals appears on p. 64, n. 2.

2. J. A. Sanders, "ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ in Matt 2 23," p. 170.

3. This solution to the problem of the Nazarene quotation was proposed long ago by Alfred Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques (2 vols.; The author: Ceffonds /Haute-Marne/, 1907-8), I, 375-76.

suggested by the fact that this OT account of Samson's birth is one of the paradigms for the Matthaean story of Jesus' birth. So the Matthaean Nazarene is a wordplay on the "Nazirite" of the LXX. The reference in the fulfilment formula to the plural prophets, therefore, points to the second division of the OT canon to which the Book of Judges belongs--the Prophets.[1]

Such is the relationship among the various strands of the narrative traditions and between the narrative traditions and the OT citations as they reached the First Evangelist. At this point the detailed analysis of the literary structure of Matthew i-ii draws to an end. Only the final step remains in this exploration of the literary origins of these chapters: the overall contribution of the First Evangelist in the composition of Matthew i-ii.

The First Evangelist and the Composition of Matthew I-II

In his composition of Matthew i-ii, the First Evangelist has access to a body of oral tradition whose remains are entombed in Mt.i.18-ii.21. Generally this tradition included the story of Jesus' virginal birth and the narrative complex which reports the visit of the Magi, the deceit and hatred of Herod, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter at Bethlehem, and the return to Israel. Associated with the appropriate episodes were the OT citations from Isa.vii.14, Micah v.2, Hos.xi.1, and Jer.xxxi.15. In writing up this oral material, the First Evangelist introduces each of the OT citations with his own characteristic fulfilment formula. Furthermore, he places each of the introductory formula-OT citation aggregates into the narrative material so as to form some five

---

1. Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques, I, 375-76. Also see M'Neile, Matthew, p. 22.

narrative LITERARY UNITS: i.18-25; ii.1-12, 13-15, 16-18, 19-21. Of these only the last has no introductory formula-OT citation cluster.

To this mass of material the First Evangelist prefaces a genealogy which he himself composed specifically in the light of the story of Jesus' virginal birth (i.18b-25). So the genealogy anticipates this first narrative. More than this, however, this first narrative also refers back to the genealogy. In this regard, the present story of Jesus' virginal birth betrays the hand of the First Evangelist. Firstly, the Evangelist introduces the story with a superscription: Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way (= Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν, vs.18a). Both in the use of the double name Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and the word γένεσις this superscription recalls the heading over the genealogy. Because the story of Jesus' birth (vss.18b-25) and the preceding genealogy (vss.2-16) are prefaced by visibly similar headings, it might at first appear that these two LITERARY UNITS parallel each other. But this is not the case; for the principal way in which the superscription over the birth story binds it to the genealogy is by the mention of Jesus' birth (= γένεσις).[1] On the one hand, this points back to the mention in the genealogy of the birth of Jesus: . . . of whom was born

---

1. Traditionally this γένεσις has been rendered birth. For this translation among the English versions, see the following: KJV, American, Moffatt, RSV, Phillips, and NEB. But Krister Stendahl proposes "origin" as the more appropriate translation. He observes: "The birth of Jesus is not described in Mt, where the points are rather the angelic revelation to Joseph, and the naming of the child (8 days after its birth?; Luk 2 21)," "Quis et unde?," p. 102. Consequently, "I read γένεσις, and take it to retain its genealogical sense (cf. Mt 1 1) Lk 1 14 notwithstanding; this is the natural sense in Mt if we were not under the sway of Lucan and traditional 'Christmas pressure'," "Quis et unde?," pp. 101-102, n. 35. But "origin" is not the natural sense of γένεσις in vs.18a. The relegation of the actual birth of Jesus to the periphery of the story does not thereby make it any less a birth story. This is a feature characteristic of the OT birth accounts upon which the Matthaean story is modeled. The Evangelist, therefore, quite appropriately uses γένεσις in the superscription in the sense of birth.

Jesus who is called Christ (vs.16). On the other hand, this points ahead to the actual birth of Jesus: . . . she had borne a son (vs.25). So placed within "birth brackets," the story of Jesus' virginal birth (vss.18-25) constitutes a detailed commentary on vs.16 of the genealogy.[1] Secondly, the First Evangelist has the Angel of the Lord address Joseph as Son of David (vs.20). This also harks back to the genealogy which calls Jesus the Son of David (vs.1). So whatever kind of pre-Matthaean association this story of Jesus' birth may have enjoyed with the narrative material of chapter ii, the First Evangelist binds it to his genealogy.

But not only does the First Evangelist preface the originally oral mass of material (i.18b-ii.21) with a superscription (i.18a) and the genealogical list (i.1-17), he also appends to it certain narrative remarks, another fulfilment formula, and the Nazarene citation (ii.22-23). In this way the concluding LITERARY UNIT (ii.19ff) is given an introductory formula-OT citation cluster.

The above description of the composition of Matthew i-ii is not intended to describe the precise way in which the Evangelist approached his task. It does, however, point out certain features of Matthew i-ii which probably betray his hand. More importantly, it underscores that aspect of the First Evangelist's contribution to the composition of Matthew i-ii about which one can be most certain: the overall structure of these chapters! The highly schematic arrangement of the four LITERARY FORMS into some six LITERARY UNITS is to be attributed to him. Again, he is certainly the one responsible

---

1. Interestingly enough, although Stendahl renders γένεσις as "origin" he still views vss.18-25, as a footnote to vs.16 of the genealogy, "Quis et unde?," p.101. Similarly, Vögtle, "Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," II, p. 243.

for the "Hauptschnitt"[1] or chief division of Matthew i-ii which falls between the two chapters.[2] The structure of Matthew i-ii, therefore, appears thus:

A. Chapter i
   1. Genealogy--vss.1-17
   2. Narrative--vss.18-25

B. Chapter ii
   3. Narrative--vss.1-12
   4. Narrative--vss.13-15
   5. Narrative--vss.16-18
   6. Narrative--vss.19-23

It is just this arrangement of the traditions in Matthew i-ii that reveals the theological interest of the First Evangelist in affixing them to the beginning of his Gospel. So this leads to the consideration of Matthew i-ii and the theology of the First Evangelist.

---

1. Vögtle, "Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," II, 247.

2. This evaluation of the structure of Matthew i-ii differs from that presented by many commentators. Recognizing that the genealogy stands in rather sharp contrast to the other infancy traditions in terms of its literary form, they often divide the infancy account between the genealogy and the narrative material. Among these are the following: Johnson, Matthew, p. 246; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 7; and Gaechter, Matthäus, p. 5.

Chapter II

MATTHEW I-II AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE FIRST EVANGELIST

Matthew i-ii contains a multitude of theological ideas and themes. The detailed literary analysis of these chapters exposed many of them. Jesus is heralded as the Messiah, the Son of David, the King of the Jews. He is also introduced as one conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary. He is portrayed as one rejected by his own people but worshipped by Gentiles. Parallels are drawn between Jesus and Moses, Jesus and Israel. The flight of Joseph with his family into Egypt to avoid Herod's persecution recapitulates the flight of Jacob with his family into Egypt to escape Laban's persecution. Countless other motifs have been detected, or allegedly detected, in these chapters.[1] The present theological analysis of Matthew i-ii, however, is not particularly interested in cataloging all the theological themes embedded within their pages. Such a treatment is one-dimensional; for it does not distinguish between tradition and interpretation. This theological evaluation of Matthew i-ii is primarily interested in the First Evangelist's handling

---

1. Among the more bizarre suggestions in this regard is that advanced by P. J. Thompson, "Infancy Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke Compared," pp. 217-22. Viewing Gen.xxv-xxxv as the model for the Matthaean infancy narratives, Thompson draws elaborate parallels between Isaac and Jesus. For instance, as the ram served as the substitutionary sacrifice in Isaac's stead, so the children of Bethlehem served as a substitutionary sacrifice in Jesus' stead.

of the material in these chapters and hence in those motifs which serve his dominant theological concerns. Such a treatment is two-dimensional; for it strives to distinguish between tradition and interpretation. Strictly speaking, therefore, the following is not so much a discussion of the theology of Matthew i-ii as a consideration of Matthew i-ii and the theology of the First Evangelist.

The Individuality of Matthew i-ii

The Matthaean and the Lucan infancy narratives do have a few features in common.[1] Both date the birth of Jesus in the reign of Herod the Great. Both assert that Jesus was born in Bethlehem but brought up in Nazareth. Both say that his mother was named Mary and a virgin at the time of his conception by the Holy Spirit. Both state that Mary's husband was named Joseph and a member of the Davidic family. In both the name "Jesus" is bestowed in obedience to the behest of the Angel of the Lord.

These similarities, however, are overshadowed by the vast differences between the Matthaean and the Lucan accounts. There are fundamental differences in detail.[2] In St. Matthew the annunciation is made to Joseph in a dream. But in St. Luke the annunciation is made to Mary in a waking state. In St. Matthew Joseph learns of his betrothed spouse's pregnancy and resolves to divorce her. In St. Luke no mention is made of Joseph's reaction to his wife's pregnancy. Only St. Matthew tells the stories of the Magi, the flight into Egypt, the massacre of the children at Bethlehem, and the return to

---

1. Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 29.

2. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

Israel. Only St. Luke relates the stories of the shepherds, the presentation of the infant Jesus in the Temple, and the twelve-year-old Jesus in the Temple. In St. Matthew Bethlehem is apparently the home of Mary and Joseph, and they later settle in Nazareth after the return from Egypt. In St. Luke Nazareth is the home of Mary and Joseph, and they journey to Bethlehem for the Roman census.

Because of these irreconcilable differences, it is sheer folly to maintain that the Matthaean and the Lucan narratives are derived from the same manuscript.[1] It is untenable to hold that Luke was familiar with the Matthaean stories.[2] Whatever the ultimate origin of these two divergent infancy cycles, they have certainly enjoyed a long period of independence from one another. This means that neither Evangelist was shaping his own infancy account in the light of the other. A comparison of the Matthaean infancy account with the Lucan story, however, brings into sharper focus the individuality of the former account.[3] Out of such a comparison come certain hints as to exactly what the First Evangelist is doing theologically with the traditions of Jesus' birth and infancy. This is particularly true when the comparison concentrates more upon general characteristics than specific narrative details.

1. In St. Matthew the infancy story opens with the genealogy of Jesus. Running in descending order from Abraham through David, it follows the ruling Davidic line; and the royal status of David is underlined (i.6). The point

---

1. So F. W. Goodman, "Sources of the First Two Chapters in Matthew and Luke," ChQR, CLXII (1961), 136-43.

2. So Thompson, "Infancy Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke Compared," pp. 217-22.

3. Anton Vögtle employs a similar technique to his advantage, "Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," I, 54-58.

seems to be Jesus, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (vss.1, 17). A special feature of the list is the inclusion of five women including Mary the mother of Jesus. Furthermore, the genealogy is schematically divided into three groups of fourteen generations. Insofar as these divisions correspond to the three great epochs in the history of Israel, they introduce a salvation history motif into the genealogy.

In St. Luke the genealogy does not even appear in the infancy story. It is connected with the heavenly voice at the baptism of Jesus (iii.22). Running in ascending order from Jesus through David and Abraham to Adam, it follows a non-ruling line of the Davidic family. The Davidic element, therefore, is not emphasized. Instead, the point seems to be Jesus, Son of God (iii.38). Women are not named in the genealogy; and it is brought into line with the virgin birth by a parenthetical comment (iii.23). Furthermore, although a numerical arrangement of the generations can be detected beneath the unbroken chain of names,[1] this arrangement is not expressly underscored. The genealogy does not particularly recall the past history of Israel.

2. St. Matthew exhibits a rigorously christocentric orientation. The infancy narrative is comprised exclusively of stories about the birth and childhood of Jesus. No mention is made of John the messianic precursor. Again, in these stories Joseph is the dominant parental personality rather than Mary. To him comes the divine announcement of Jesus' conception, birth, and name (i.20ff). To him come the subsequent divine commands (ii.13, 19, 21). Through him the action progresses. In spite of Joseph's importance in the

---

1. Léon Ramlot sees the seventy-seven names ordered according to this pattern: 3 X 7, 2 X 7, 3 X 7, 3 X 7, "Les généalogies bibliques. Un genre littéraire oriental," BiViChr, LX (1964), p. 63.

Matthaean infancy stories, however, he nowhere becomes the object of special praise or veneration. The only possible exception to this is the brief recognition of his righteousness (i.19). Rather Joseph acts only for the son of Mary his wife, that is for Jesus. So it is actually Jesus who casts the giant shadow across these pages. This is borne out by the OT citations; for they are used to establish the actions of Jesus rather than Joseph. Jesus is the Emmanuel (i.23), the ruler (ii.6), the son (ii.15c), and the Nazarene (ii.23c).

But St. Luke displays a much less christocentric orientation. The infancy narrative includes stories about the birth and childhood of John the messianic forerunner. In fact, the contrast between John and Jesus constitutes the theological basis for the literary structure of Luke i-ii.[1] So instead of beginning with the genealogy of Jesus the Messiah, the Lucan narrative opens with the announcement of the birth of John the messianic herald. Again, in these stories Mary is the principal parental personality rather than Joseph. To her comes the divine announcement of Jesus' conception, birth, and name (i.28ff). To her frequent reference is made (i.39ff; ii.19, 34ff). Although Mary does act for her son Jesus, she herself is the object of special praise and veneration (i.28, 43; ii.34ff).[2] By the Angel of the Lord she is hailed, "O favored one!" By Elizabeth she is called "the mother of my Lord." So although Jesus may have the starring role, he is occasionally offstage; and John and Mary are among the chief characters in a rather sizeable supporting cast.

3. The tone of St. Matthew is didactic and its style demonstrative.

---

1. See the discussion by René Laurentin, Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II, pp. 23-42.

2. Ibid., pp. 148-161. One of the chief theological motifs of the Lucan infancy stories is the identification between Mary and the OT Daughter of Zion.

But the tone of St. Luke is poetical and its style descriptive.

The tone of each is set primarily by the way it uses the OT. In St. Matthew the OT is appealed to by means of short, crisp explicit citations (i.23; ii.6, 15c, 18, 23c). Each narrative episode is "nailed down" by a terse prophetic oracle which it fulfills. So the Matthaean infancy narratives seemingly strive to make a point rather than to describe in detail the events of Jesus' early life. In St. Luke, however, the OT is referred to in allusive fashion, particularly in the lengthy speeches and canticles (as i.46-55, 66-79; ii.29-35). These speeches and canticles imbue the Lucan infancy narratives with a certain lyrical quality. They reverberate with the joyful strains of messianic gladness. They celebrate the momentous events which their narrative frameworks depict in some detail.

The contrasting styles of each are clearly discernible in a number of areas.

For the most part, the narrative scenes in the Matthaean story are quite concise. Particularly noticeable in this regard are the accounts of the flight to Egypt and the subsequent return to the land of Israel (ii.13ff, 19ff). These potentially dramatic events are dismissed with very brief statements of their occurrence. Involved in this conciseness of narrative scene is a general lack of concern for what might be called biographical details. In the birth episode, no mention is made of either time or place (i.18-25). Therein Mary is found to be pregnant; but the discoverer of her condition is not named (i.18). The actual birth and naming of Jesus are noted; but no description is offered of the ceremonies which accompanied such events (i.25). Although the second chapter opens with a temporal comment (ii.1), the references to time elsewhere in the chapter are quite general. In fact, the happenings beginning with the appearance of the Magi in Jerusalem and concluding with Joseph's

withdrawal into Egypt are related in such a way as to suggest that all these incidents occurred on the same night (ii.1-14). Similarly, the length of the sojourn in Egypt is unspecified. It simply lasts until the death of King Herod (ii.15, 20). Other so called biographical questions remain unanswered in this chapter. For instance, the Magi come from the East and return to their own country, but the name of their native land is not designated (ii.1, 12).

The narrative scenes in the Lucan infancy account are rather lengthy and recount in some detail the events surrounding the infancies of John and Jesus. In particular, such cultic and religious rites as the burning of incense, the naming and circumcision of a newborn child, and the purification of the parents are carefully described (i.5ff, 57ff, ii.21, 22ff). Throughout the different scenes are subtle connections which bind them together into a continuous story.[1] The announcement and realization of John's conception by Elizabeth (i.15, 24) looks ahead to the notice of the babe's leap in her womb (i.41) and the statement of his birth (i.57). The angelic proclamation that Zechariah would be struck dumb until after the birth of his son John (i.24) anticipates the loosing of his tongue on the day of John's circumcision (i.64). Similarly, the announcement of Jesus' birth and name (i.31) points forward to his actual birth and naming (ii.7, 21). Furthermore, throughout the different scenes are very specific temporal notes (i.5, 24, 26, 36, 39, 56, 57, 59; ii.1ff, 21, 22, 41ff).[2] Summary statements bridge the yawning gaps between the infancies and the adulthoods of both John and Jesus (i.80; ii.40, 52).

---

1. Laurentin, Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II, pp. 44-45.
2. Ibid., pp. 48ff.

So the Lucan narratives do pay attention to biographical details.

Within the short narrative scenes of the Matthaean infancy story, dialogue is kept to a minimum. Outside of the Magi episode (ii.1-12), the only speech appears on the lips of the Angel of the Lord (i.20ff; ii.13, 20). Even more striking is the fact that throughout the infancy stories, Joseph, Mary, and the child Jesus are completely mute.

Even exclusive of the longer speeches and canticles, the Lucan infancy story is frequently punctuated by discourse between two or more persons (i.18, 38, 42ff, 60ff; ii.15). And even a logion of Jesus is preserved in the account of his disputation in the Temple at twelve years of age (ii.49).

Finally, in St. Matthew the narrative scenes are so curtailed and the dialogue so restricted that the characters therein are not very lifelike. In particular, moving in response to the command of the Angel of the Lord, Joseph and his family seem to be acting out a divinely controlled game of charades. Reacting to the birth of the King of the Jews (ii.2) with fear and hatred, Herod is probably the most human and believable character in the entire story.

In St. Luke God is no less in control; yet the characters generally possess verisimilitude. There is the questioning of Zechariah (i.18), the embarrassment and the excitement of Elizabeth (i.24, 42ff), the awe of Zechariah's neighbors (i.63ff), the piety of Simeon and Anna (ii.25ff, 36ff), the precociousness of Jesus (ii.41ff), and the concern of his mother (ii.48).

In several areas, therefore, the demonstrative style of the Matthaean infancy account and the contrasting descriptive style of the Lucan infancy narrative are revealed.

A comparison of the Matthaean infancy account with the Lucan infancy narrative does throw into relief the individuality of the former story. The Matthaean story begins with a genealogy, displays a rather rigorous christo-centric orientation, and possesses a didactic tone and a demonstrative style.

So the comparison intimates that the First Evangelist may be trying to establish something about the origins of Jesus Christ, that is Jesus the Messiah.

Towards an Understanding of Matthew I-II

More than anyone else, Krister Stendahl with his article in the Jeremias Festschrift has prepared the way for a correct understanding of these chapters and their significance for the First Evangelist.[1] That which distinguishes his work from other theological evaluations of Matthew i-ii is his interest in discerning the theology of the First Evangelist rather than simply reviewing the many motifs preserved in these chapters.[2] Stendahl states: "Whatever the sources, Mt works here with a clarity of purpose, which should allow us to find out what he thinks that he is doing with his material."[3] With this assumption he undertakes an explication of what the Evangelist is doing with his material in Matthew i-ii.

Because of his serious attempt to distinguish between tradition and interpretation, the work of Stendahl merits a rather detailed review. Thereby his study serves as the basis for the explication of the theology of the First Evangelist which is to follow. So Stendahl moves this study towards an understanding of Matthew i-ii.

The proposal of Krister Stendahl. In developing his thesis, Stendahl examines chapter two before considering chapter one. He begins:

---

1. "Quis et unde?," pp. 94-105.

2. Among those theological evaluations which tend to gloss over the distinction between tradition and interpretation is the exhaustive study by Anton Vögtle, "Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," II, 239-62. Because of this his contribution is not reviewed in detail.

3. "Quis et unde?, " p. 96.

> Mt 2 is dominated by geographical names. This is the more striking in contrast to ch. 1, which has not a single one, not even where we would expect them, i.e. in 1 18f. The chapter begins with the mentioning of Bethlehem of Judea, it takes us to Egypt, describes the massacre at Bethlehem, takes us out of Egypt back to the land of Israel, bypasses Judea, takes us into Galilee and settles down in Nazareth. For Mt this itinerary is not a frame secondary to his intention. On the contrary, these geographical names constitute what is really important to him, as can be seen from his use of the formula quotations: The common denominator of the four formula quotations in ch. 2 is that they all contain geographical names, names which substantiate the point reached in the "itinerary".[1]

According to Stendahl, at two points in particular these quotations reveal that they are primarily concerned with location rather than "event":

> 1. The prophecy "Out of Egypt did I call my son" is placed by Mt, not where the call out of Egypt takes place (v.19), but where Egypt occurs for the first time (vv.13-15). Hence it is obvious that Mt wants to nail down "Egypt" in the itinerary.
> 2. LXX AX*, Vulgate, Aquila and the Targum all suppress the geographical name רמה in Jer 31 (38) 15, in a manner typical of the LXX, by translating ἐν τῇ ὑψηλῇ. This may well be the prevailing interpretation in Judaism and hence Mt's use of the geographical name is not self-evident, but stressed in order to serve a geographical quotation.[2]

Stendahl next turns to a consideration of the apologetic motivation behind such a geographical exposition as that evidenced in this second chapter:

> If the geographical information is what gives the structure to Mt 2, then this chapter gives the answer to a question, similar to the two raised in Jn 7 41f: ⟨"Is the Christ to come from Galilee? Has not the scripture said that the Christ is descended from David and comes from Bethlehem, the village where David was?"⟩ . . . But the question must have been a real one: How was it that Jesus the Messiah came from a Galilean village? Hence the whole second chapter of Mt has its climax in its last verse . . . "that he should be called Ναζωραῖος". The chapter shows how God himself, according to prophecies and through divine and angelic intervention, leads Joseph, and thereby Jesus, from Bethlehem to Nazareth. The cry in Ramah then forms a prophetic alibi: It is obvious that they had to

---

1. "Quis et unde?," p. 97.

2. Ibid.

> get the boy out of Bethlehem. The title to be written over the chapter would be: How it came to pass that the Messiah came from Nazareth.[1]

Among the problems pertaining to the Magi episode, the problem of the absence of the fulfilment formula over the Micah prophecy is elucidated by such an understanding:

> The unique way in which the Bethlehem-quotation lacks the usual Matthean introductory formula is easier to understand if we see the apologetic tension between "Bethlehem as expected" and "Nazareth as revealed". This coincides with the situation of Jn 7, to which we have just referred.[2]

Such is Stendahl's exposition of the Evangelist's dominant concern in the second chapter. His treatment is rather neat and straightforward. But his exposition of the Evangelist's interest in the first chapter is a bit more labyrinthine:

> Once it has been recognized how ch. 2 is totally focused in its geographical names, it appears that ch.1 has not only a similarly apologetic purpose, but also a similar structure, now centered around personal names. . . . Of greater significance is the observation that from the point of view of literary form, 1 18-25 could be called a legend of divine name-giving. The revelation of the angel and Joseph's obedient answer is the nucleus of the pericope. . . . As a divine giving of the name 1 18-25 has its genuine Matthean point and climax in its last words, as had ch. 2.[3]

The apologetic intention of this story of the divine name-giving appears when it is viewed in relation to the preceding genealogy; for the principal line of demarcation in the infancy story lies between the two chapters rather than between the genealogy and the narrative material:

> The genealogy in its Matthean form points to what follows in 1 18-25 by its accentuation of the Davidic line. This is clear from the way in which David is epitomized in vv.1 and 17, possibly

---

1. "Quis et unde?," pp. 97-98.

2. Ibid., p. 100.

3. Ibid.

also by the formula "three times fourteen," where דוד equals 4+6+4=14; and in 1 6 the royal status of David, and only of David, is stressed.

The link between the genealogy and vv.18-25 is more specific in the mentioning of the four women Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bath-Sheba. The common denominator for these four women is found in that they represent an "irregularity" in the Davidic line, an irregularity which is not only overcome by God's recognition of them as mothers of Davidic descendents: Exactly by the irregularity the action of God and his Spirit is made manifest. But as was the case in olden times, such divine interventions lead to slander from contemporaries who do not understand the ways of the Lord. In this light Mt presents his apologetic argument about how Jesus was engrafted into the Davidic pedigree.[1]

As an enlarged footnote upon vs.16 of the genealogy, the legend of the divine name-giving, vss.18-25, presents this argument:

Schlatter has been more sensitive to the Matthean material in Mt 1 18-25 when he calls the pericope "Die Einpflanzung Jesu in das Geschlecht Davids". This engrafting is described with considerable precision, in a way aimed at overcoming slanderous remarks by placing Joseph in that same attitude of suspicion, and by showing how Joseph's hesitation was overcome by the angelic revelation. Hence the suspicion is not that Joseph should have been the actual father of the child, but that Mary should have deceived him. But even this rebuttal is secondary to Mt's intention. The genuine point is that the angel encourages Joseph, the son of David, to make this child a Davidic child. Thereby Jesus' place within the genealogy is explained. God has ordered this engrafting. Furthermore, the name Jesus is shown to be according to God's order. On both these points Joseph is explicitly reported to have obeyed: He takes Mary to his wife and gives her child the name Jesus.[2]

It is into this context that the Evangelist inserts the Emmanuel prophecy from Is.vii.14:

If we were to take our key from ch.2 strictly, we could surmise that the salient point in the quotation from Isa 7 14 was Immanuel, i.e. the personal name; such an understanding would also make the explicit translation /"God with us"/ more natural. Then the /"the virgin shall conceive and bear a son"/ would be the basis for the application of the title Immanuel, not the point itself. That Immanuel is meant by Mt as a title is clear from the plural /"they shall call"/ . . . this against all known OT texts. It should be noted that while Isa 7 14 was not--as far as we know--used as a

---

1. "Quis et unde?," p. 101.

2. Ibid., p. 102.

> messianic prophecy in Judaism, it stands within the Davidic line. And the title Immanuel underscores the messianic function of Jesus, who is to set his (!) people free from their sins. In short: The Immanuel prophecy substantiates the significance of the name Jesus as expressed in v.21, an interesting and typically Matthean contrast to the easy conflation in Lk 1 31![1]

This usage of the messianic/christological designations Jesus and Emmanuel, according to Stendahl, has important implications for understanding the relation of these verses to the biblical witness to the virgin birth:

> It is obvious that the supernatural birth of Jesus was known to Mt, and the tradition was apparently known well enough to have given rise to slanderous remarks. But it is equally clear that Mt is not announcing the birth story. Furthermore in Mt the Virgin Birth Story is theologically mute, no christological argument or insight is deduced from this great divine intervention. . . . One could even raise the question whether Mt has thought of this intervention of God through the Spirit as an absolutely unique event. Does he not rather see it as a glorious heightening of the divine interventions of old, by which God proved faithful to his covenant with Abraham and his promises to David? This last event makes it all fall into the prophetical pattern of messianic fulfilment: Born through divine intervention, recognized by Joseph, and thereby the Son of David, he is given the name Jesus, i.e. he comes with the bliss of the age to come: Immanuel.[2]

Stendahl sums up his thesis in these words:

> These names /i.e. the Son of David, Jesus, and Emmanuel/ are matters that count with Matthew. And they deserve attention and defense; as did the tension between Bethlehem and Nazareth. Thus Mt's first two chapters substantiate and defend the decisive Names (ch. 1) and the Locale (ch. 2) of the messianic event. It is only under such circumstances that we can understand Mt's transition to the Markan material by the phrase /"In those days" . . ./ (3 1). If Mt had thought of what he had given in chs.1-2 as an account of events, such a link would presuppose a carelessness or a slavish and automatic combination of sources, which we do not find congenial to the Matthean procedure in general. If the point in chs.1-2 is the one we have suggested, it makes good sense, since here in ch.3, and first here, begins the "account", the "events". That account is prefaced by an apologetic and scriptural answer to the questions Quis et Unde.[3]

---

1. "Quis et unde?," p. 103.

2. Ibid., pp. 103-104.

3. Ibid., pp. 104-105.

The proposal of Krister Stendahl reviewed. Undoubtedly the most consistently perceptive aspect of his work is his analysis of the second chapter. He rightly views it as a literary and ideational complex to be studied over against the initial chapter. Dominated by geographical names, the chapter deals with a question similar to that posed by Jn.vii.41f: How did the Messiah come from Nazareth? Thus he sharply defines the kind of question the Evangelist attempts to answer; and he convincingly demonstrates the key role played by the formula citations in that reply.

Although Stendahl's treatment of the first chapter contains important insights into the Evangelist's interest in this chapter, the several facets of Stendahl's argument do not cohere as they did in his explication of chapter two. He is certainly correct in his delineation of the basic structure of the chapter. The story of Jesus' birth (vss.18-25) is a commentary on vs.16 of the preceding genealogy. Again, this story does concern itself with the engrafting of Jesus into the Davidic pedigree. Furthermore personal names are highly significant in this regard. Therefore, Stendahl stands on the very threshold of perceiving what the Evangelist is really doing in this chapter. But he fails for perhaps two reasons. Firstly, he affirms but does not capitalize upon the insight that the genealogy dominates the entire chapter. For instance, although Stendahl stresses the importance of the names Jesus and Emmanuel in the birth story, he does not inquire as to what these names, or at least the name Emmanuel, may have in common with the names so prominent in the genealogy, i.e. the Son of David, the Son of Abraham. In fact, he only briefly mentions the former and overlooks altogether the latter. Yet it is the table of Jesus' descent that offers the clue to the Evangelist's interest throughout this first chapter. Secondly, Stendahl revives the often heard claim that the Evangelist, particularly in vss.18-25, is refuting slanderous remarks aimed at Mary. Parenthetically, it may be noted that Stendahl

is rather vague in his statement of the precise nature of these remarks. Presumably she is smeared as an adulteress. But this preoccupation with the so called apologetic intention of the birth story prevents him from appraising adequately the relationship between the story and the preceding genealogy. Consequently, Stendahl's evaluation of the first chapter needs to be refined at a number of points.

In conclusion, Stendahl's preoccupation with the apologetic intention of the birth story also leads him to assess wrongly the importance of the virgin birth for the First Evangelist. By no means is the birth story theologically mute with regard to the virginal character of Jesus' conception and birth. Nevertheless, with the work of Stendahl great strides have been taken towards a more adequate understanding of the significance of Matthew i-ii for the First Evangelist.

The Origins of Jesus Christ

According to Krister Stendahl, the First Evangelist employs the infancy traditions to offer an apologetic and scriptural answer to the questions Quis et Unde, who and from where. Such a depiction of the Evangelist's concern approximates but does not quite adequately express what he is doing with these traditions. More correctly, the First Evangelist presents a dogmatic and scriptural answer to the questions from whom and from where. In other words, he is pre-eminently concerned with the messianic origins of Jesus, the origins of Jesus Christ. He strives to demonstrate not only that with his origins Jesus possesses messianic qualifications but that his origins establish him as the Messiah. The structure of Matthew i-ii, therefore, may be outlined as follows:

A. The genealogical origins of Jesus Christ--chapter i
   1. The Son of David, the Son of Abraham--vss.1-17
   2. Emmanuel--vss.18-25

B. The geographical origins of Jesus Christ--chapter ii
   3. Bethlehem--vss.1-12
   4. Egypt--vss.13-15
   5. Bethlehem--vss.16-18
   6. Nazareth--vss.19-23

That such represents a valid characterization of the Evangelist's interest in these chapters must now be demonstrated. The discussion falls into three parts: a consideration of chapter one; a study of chapter two; and a final examination of the major factors which prompt the Evangelist to treat these chapters as he does.

The genealogical origins of Jesus Christ (chapter i). This initial chapter is dominated by the genealogy with which it begins; for the story of the virgin birth (vss.18-25) constitutes a commentary upon the cryptic allusion to that birth in the genealogy (vs.16). The recognition of this fact is the appropriate point of departure for an understanding of the First Evangelist's dominant concern in this chapter. Contrary to Stendahl, therefore, the point of departure for elucidating the Evangelist's interest is not the acknowledgement of the birth story (vss.18-25) as a story of divine name giving. Whether one refers to the form of this story as a birth legend (as in the preceding literary analysis) or as a legend of divine name giving (as Stendahl), the divine revelation of the name Jesus (vs.21) and the bestowal of that name (vs.25) are important features of the story. But with the binding of this story to the genealogy and with the addition of the OT citation (vss.22-23), the major stress no longer falls upon the name giving itself.

The chapter opens with a superscription: The genealogy of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (= βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυεὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ). These few words present NT scholarship with two

rather vexing questions: What is the correct translation of βίβλος γενέσεως? What is the scope of the entire superscription? These queries have received divergent answers.[1] The more viable solution to these related problems, however, is that which translates βίβλος γενέσεως as "the book of the origin" (i.e. the genealogy) and views the superscription as a heading for just the genealogy proper (vss.2-16). The βίβλος γενέσεως recalls Gen.v.1 (LXX) wherein a similar phrase functions genealogically. Also, the names in the superscription point to the following table of Jesus' forebears. This initial chapter, therefore, opens with a superscription which introduces the genealogy.

The catena of names in the superscription is visibly striking (note the absence of definite articles) and theologically significant. The

---

1. These answers include the following: (1) βίβλος γενέσεως is translated "the book of the history"; and the superscription introduces the whole Gospel. So Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, p. 1, and Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 9. Support for this view comes from such OT (LXX) passages as Gen.vi.9, xxxvii.2, where γένεσις means "history" or "story". (2) βίβλος γενέσεως is rendered "the book of the (New) Creation"; and the heading still stands over the entire Gospel. So Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 30; also see Davies, Sermon on the Mount, pp. 67-72. (3) βίβλος γενέσεως is translated "the book of the generation"; and the heading stands over Mt.i.1-iv.16. So Edgar Krentz, "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Toward the Structure of the First Gospel," JBL, LXXXIII (1964), p. 414. (4) βίβλος γενέσεως is translated "the book of the origin"; and the superscription covers only the infancy stories, Mt. i-ii. So Allen, Matthew, pp. 1-2. (5) βίβλος γενέσεως is still translated "the book of the origin"; but the superscription introduces the virgin birth episode and the genealogy, Mt.i. So Vögtle, "Matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," II, p. 246. (6) βίβλος γενέσεως is again rendered "the book of the origin" (=the genealogy); but the superscription stands only above the genealogy, Mt.i.2-16. So Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp.3-4, Stendahl, "Matthew," p. 770, and Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 3. (7) βίβλος γενέσεως possesses an intentional ambiguous meaning; and the heading serves a double role. Therefore βίβλος γενέσεως may be translated either "the book of the history" or "the book of the origin"; and the superscription introduces both the Gospel in its entirety and the genealogy, Mt.i.2-16. So Bonnard, Matthieu, pp. 15-16.

Evangelist immediately announces his interest in Jesus' messianic origins. In the rare Matthaean collocation Jesus Christ,[1] the Christ seems reduced to the status of a proper name. But as vs.17 makes quite clear the Evangelist still perceives its messianic import. So Jesus Messiah is the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.

In his exposition of this initial chapter, Krister Stendahl calls attention to the importance of the personal names Jesus and Emmanuel for the First Evangelist; yet for the most part he overlooks the names the Son of David and the Son of Abraham with which the Evangelist begins his Gospel. Viewed within the context of the genealogical half of this first chapter (vss.1-17), these two names constitute what is of primary importance to the Evangelist. This is borne out by the genealogy (vss.2-16) and the summary statement (vs.17) which follow the superscription (vs.1). Herein the Evangelist singles out two of Jesus' ancestral fathers for special recognition--Abraham and David. He calls attention to Abraham by beginning his genealogical roll call with him (vs.2). Although he also calls attention to David by beginning the second section of the genealogy with his name (vs.6b), the Evangelist underscores his name in an even more conspicuous way. Among the many kings of Judea (vss.6-11) only the royal status of David, the first king, is explicitly noted (vs.6a). Both Abraham and David are mentioned again in the subscription: So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon are fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ are fourteen

---

1. The only other occasions in which this double name appears in St. Matthew are disputed readings (i.18, xvi.21). Elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels, it is attested only in the opening verse of St. Mark (i.1). The only two uncontested Synoptic readings of the name "Jesus Christ," therefore, are in the first verses of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew respectively. It is likely then that the First Evangelist adopts it under the influence of his Marcan source.

generations (vs.17). These references to Abraham and David are of no small importance; for they show that these two ancestors of Jesus, and precisely these, are the ones who interest the Evangelist. He does not simply repeat the names of those forebears who stand at the junctures of the genealogy. If this were the case, the name of Jechoniah would be included in this summary statement. Instead, the deportation to Babylon is singled out for special mention. This shows that within the genealogical matter, the Evangelist is indeed concerned pre-eminently with Abraham and David. This throws into relief the two designations for Jesus in the superscription: the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (vs.1). These names epitomize the Evangelist's concern within the opening section of chapter one for the genealogical origins of Jesus. These two titles are of significance to the Evangelist because they point beyond themselves to Jesus' genealogical origins. Jesus is of Davidic and of Abrahamic descent!

Such lineage certainly endows Jesus with the proper credentials for messiahship. The title the Son of David has its roots in Jewish messianism; for the belief that the Messiah or a Messiah would arise from among David's descendents comprises one of the more persistent ingredients within that diverse hope. Indeed, the phrase "son of David" itself appears as a messianic appellation in Pss.Sol.xvii.23.[1] The title the Son of Abraham, however, does not have such deep rootage in Jewish messianic expectation. In fact, according to the witness of the NT, the phrase "son of Abraham" and other related

---

1. For the usage of the expression "son of David" as a messianic title in Rabbinic sources, consult Gustaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus, translated by D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), pp. 317-18.

expressions were commonly used non-messianically with the meaning of "a Jew."[1] The assumption behind this employment of the phrase is that Abraham was the father of Israel, that is the father of all Jews.[2] Furthermore, the Abrahamic descent of the Messiah is rarely stressed within Jewish literature.[3] Insofar as the Messiah would be a Jew, it is assumed that he would be of Abrahamic origin. Bearing the titles the Son of David, the Son of Abraham, therefore, Jesus fulfills the explicitly affirmed Davidic requirements and the implicitly expected Abrahamic requirements for messiahship.

Insofar as he is of Davidic and of Abrahamic lineage, however, Jesus does not differ appreciably from many of his forebears, such as Joseph, Jacob, Matthan, etc. All of them likewise can claim both Davidic and Abrahamic origin. Therefore, in tracing Jesus' genealogical connections, the First Evangelist does more than simply show that Jesus is related to David and to Abraham. He demonstrates that Jesus is the (not a) Son of David and the (not a) Son of Abraham. That is, he demonstrates that Jesus, and no other, is the Messiah foreordained by God.

The Evangelist accomplishes this feat by the artificial construction of the genealogy. The forty-two generations are arranged into three tiers of fourteen generations each:

---

1. See Lk.xiii.16, xix.9; Jn.viii.33, 37, 39; II Cor.xi.22; Heb.ii.7, etc. Particularly instructive in this regard is the introduction of Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch: "Brethren, sons of the family of Abraham, and those among you who fear God . . ." (Acts xiii.26). The "sons of the family of Abraham" are those who are Jewish by birth. "Those among you who fear God" are those who are Jewish by religious observance and Gentile by birth. So the equation "son of Abraham" = "a Jew" is sharply drawn.

2. Gen.xiiff. For the varying conceptions of Abraham within first century Judaism, consult Samuel Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1956), pp. 30-95.

3. But Test. Lev.viii.15.

14 (2 x 7) generations from Abraham to David
14 (2 x 7) generations from David to the deportation
14 (2 x 7) generations from the deportation to the Christ

In order to achieve this symmetry, the Evangelist omits from the list certain generations with which he was probably familiar. A comparison of the second group of generations with OT sources (as 1 Chr.iii.10ff) suggests that he suppresses the names of some four kings of Judea--Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah, and Jehoiakim.[1] Also, both a comparison of the third group of generations with the corresponding generation section in the Lucan genealogy (iii.23-27) and the observation that the third group of generations contains too few names for the lengthy time span between Zerubbabel and Joseph intimate that the Evangelist may have deleted names from this group.

Whatever specific factors may have influenced the Evangelist in his schematization of the genealogy,[2] and whatever values he may have attached to the numbers used in its construction,[3] this table of descent reflects a view

---

1. For a discussion of these omissions, see p. 44, n. 2.

2. Among the more common suggestions are the following: (1) The 3 x 14 division of the genealogy stems from the mere fact that Israel's history is naturally divided into three periods and the OT lists fourteen generations from Abraham to David. So Lagrange, Matthieu, pp. 2-3. But the question remains: Why did the Evangelist choose to retain the number 14 for the final two generation sections? (2) The 3 x 14 division is connected with the name David which has three consonants and whose combined numerical value equals fourteen (דוד ,4+6+4=14). So Robinson, Matthew, p. 3, Filson, Matthew, p. 53, and many others. (3) The 3 x 14 division reflects the influence of apocalyptic arithmetic which used numbers to divide the historical process into great epochs. So Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 2, and George Foot Moore, "Fourteen Generations: 490 Years," HTR, XIV (1921), 97-103.

3. A modest proposal: The number 7 is a sacred number and often reflects the supernatural. Perhaps the presence of the 7 throughout the genealogy reinforces what the schematic form itself suggests: God is the author and sustainer of Israel's history. The number 3 naturally connotes the idea of completeness (beginning-middle-end). The division of the genealogy into 3 parts also reinforces something else the overall schematic form suggests: with Jesus the eschatological consummation of Israel's history has dawned.

of history closely akin to that common in Jewish apocalyptic thought. Expressing one of the dominant concerns of apocalypticism, the seer Ezra cries, "When will the end of the first age and the beginning of the second age be" (II Esdr.vi.7)? To discern this crucial "when" the Apocalypticist interprets history in such a way as to arrange the entire historical process into great epochs.[1] Unlike Ezra, however, the First Evangelist knows the answer to the question. So he does not order the historical process to ascertain the "when"; rather he arranges it into three periods each with fourteen generations to demonstrate that with Jesus this "when" has occurred. Insofar as Jesus appears as the fourteenth generation of the final section of the Abrahamic-Davidic genealogy, he must be the expected Messiah. That the Evangelist uses the genealogy as an argument for his messiahship is clearly seen in the summary statement which is added to the end of the list. Although an abridged recapitulation of Jesus' genealogy, this subscription does not even mention Jesus by name. Rather from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ are fourteen generations (vs.17c).[2] On the basis of the preceding genealogical list, the reader himself makes the self-evident identification of Jesus as the Christ.

From the perspective of the demonstrative intention of the Matthaean genealogy, its salvation history character is rendered intelligible. As

---

1. Relevant sources include: Dan.vii, ix.22-27; I Enoch lxxxv-xc, xciii, xci.12-17; Assum. Mos.i.1ff; and Jub.i.1ff. For an excellent review of the Apocalyptic view of history, see Russell, Jewish Apocalyptic, pp. 195-202, 224-34.

2. Commentators usually note that the third series of generations (vss.12-16) contains only thirteen names and thus disagrees with this final statement. For instance, Johnson, Matthew, p. 253. Since the Babylonian exile is such a decisive turning point in Israel's history as well as in the genealogy, it is not unlikely that the Evangelist counted Jechoniah as both the final generation of the second series and the first generation of the third series.

observed earlier, the salvation history motif is quite appropriate in the Matthaean genealogy insofar as that genealogy stands at the head of the entire Gospel.[1] Now it appears that the salvation history motif is necessary in the Matthaean genealogy insofar as that genealogy attempts to prove Jesus' messiahship. Without the many allusions to Israel's past history, the genealogy would lose its demonstrative power. So just as God elected Judah from among the sons of Jacob as the sire of the royal-messianic line (vs.2) and chose Jechoniah from among the sons of Josiah as the perpetuator of the royal-messianic line (vss.11, 12), He raises up Jesus as the consummator of that line--as the consummator of the long history of His dealings with Israel! The promises made to Abraham (vs.2) and the covenant established with David (vs.6) are realized through this Jesus who is called Christ (vs.16).

To conclude, in the superscription to the genealogy, the Evangelist announces that in the initial portion of the first chapter (vss.1-17) he is concerned with the genealogical origins of Jesus Messiah, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (vs.1). In the body of the genealogy (vss.2-16) and in the concluding summary (vs.17), the Evangelist moves from announcement to demonstration. He strives to prove that Jesus is indeed the Messiah, the (not a) Son of David and the (not a) Son of Abraham. The demonstration of the messiahship of Jesus in these verses casts light upon the Evangelist's usage of the title the Son of Abraham as applicable to Jesus. Firstly, this establishment of Jesus' messiahship explains why the Evangelist departs from customary Jewish practice and stresses the Abrahamic descent of the Messiah, that is of Jesus. He does so because it is essential to his argument for Jesus' Davidic messiahship. He is interested in Jesus' Abrahamic origin only insofar as that origin

---

1. See above, pp. 43-45.

supports Jesus' Davidic origin and hence his Davidic status. That the Evangelist is primarily interested in Jesus' Davidic lineage and only secondarily in his Abrahamic lineage emerges in the story of Jesus' birth (vss.18-25) where he discontinues his overt stress upon Jesus' Abrahamic descent (vs.20). Secondly, this establishment of Jesus' messiahship also makes clear that the Evangelist does not follow customary usage of the name "son of Abraham" and simply apply it to Jesus with the meaning of "a Jew." For him the name is an honorific title, a messianic appellation. Jesus is the one Son of Abraham.[1]

The Evangelist follows the genealogy with the story of Jesus' birth (vss.18-25). Like the genealogy, this story is prefaced with a superscription: Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way (= Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν, vs.18a). The earlier literary analysis of Matthew i-ii disclosed that this heading refers back to vs.16 of the genealogy: Jacob was the father of Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ (= Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός). The recognition of this fact is crucial for an understanding of what the Evangelist is doing theologically in chapter one of the infancy story. Therefore, it is appropriate to note again the observation which supports it. The mention of Jesus' birth in vs.18a (= ἡ γένεσις) recalls the earlier notice of that birth in vs.16 (= ἐγεννήθη). In addition, it seems likely that the Evangelist consciously tightens the connection between vs.18 and vs.16 by carefully

---

1. This Matthaean emphasis upon Jesus the Messiah as the Son of Abraham has something of a counterpart in the Pauline exegesis of such OT passages as Gen.xii.7. The mention of "the offspring" of Abraham is interpreted by Paul in the singular and applied exclusively to Jesus (so Gal.iii.15ff).

reversing the order of the names Joseph, Mary, and Jesus. In vs.16 the arrangement is Joseph, Mary, and Jesus. But in vs.18 the order becomes Jesus, Mary, Joseph. The possibility that this reversal may represent the methodical work of the Evangelist is enhanced by the presence of a similar reversal in the genealogy. In the superscription of that list, the names of Jesus' two principal forebears are David and Abraham (vs.1). But in the genealogy itself the order becomes Abraham and David (vss.2ff).[1] So with the superscription to the story of Jesus' birth (vs.18a) and perhaps even with the beginning of the story (vs.18), the First Evangelist harks back to vs.16 of the genealogy. In other words, the account of the circumstances surrounding Jesus' birth (vss.18b-25) constitutes a commentary upon the brief mention of Jesus' entry into the Abrahamic-Davidic line of descent (vs.16). This suggests that in this story of Jesus' conception, birth, and naming, the Evangelist is still primarily interested in Jesus' genealogical origins.

The reason why Jesus' entry into the Abrahamic-Davidic line of descent (vs.16) requires special comment (vss.18-25) becomes immediately apparent: After his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together (= πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς)[2] she was found to be pregnant of the Holy Spirit (vs.18b). The presence in the genealogy of the names of Tamar (vs.3), Rahab (vs.5), Ruth (vs.5), and the wife of Uriah (vs.6), each of whom entered and continued the royal-messianic line under unusual circumstances, suggested

---

1. In the arrangement of these names in the genealogical material, the Evangelist is admittedly guided by certain chronological data which are absent in the ordering of the names Joseph, Mary, and Jesus. Yet in the arrangement of these names, he is guided by the datum of the virgin birth.

2. The verb συνελθεῖν can denote either sexual union or marital union, Arndt-Gingrich (Bauer), Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 795-96. The Matthaean context commends the former without necessarily excluding the latter.

that Mary (vs.16) similarly brought that line to its fulfilment under unusual circumstances.[1] The passive of whom was born even hinted as to what these circumstances would be (vs.16). But only with vs.18b is their amazing and miraculous character made public. Prior to intercourse with Joseph her espoused, Mary became pregnant of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, Jesus is not the son of Joseph in the same way that Joseph is the son of Jacob, etc. Insofar as he is not the son of Joseph he is not naturally of Davidic origin. It is precisely this factor that requires an elaboration (vss.18-25) upon the brief mention of Jesus' entry into the Davidic line of descent (vs.16). Essentially Stendahl is correct in acknowledging the cogency of Schlatter's title for this elaboration: "The Engrafting of Jesus into the Davidic Family."[2] In part this is indeed what vss.18-25 are all about.

Particularly interesting in vs.18b is the way in which the Evangelist not only notes Mary's pregnancy but also mentions the agent of that pregnancy: the Holy Spirit. Those such as Stendahl who perceive an apologetic motive operative in the telling of this story usually view this as a defensive maneuver on behalf of Mary.[3] The charge that Mary conceived by someone other than Joseph, and thereby committed adultery, is quickly denied. Certainly with the notice of Mary's having conceived of the Holy Spirit, vs.18b does anticipate the proclamation of that conception to Joseph by the Angel of the Lord (vs.20). Yet when the understanding of this story (vss.18-25) as a commentary upon the way in which Jesus entered the Davidic line (vs.16) is taken seriously, it is no longer necessary to view vs.18b as a rebuttal to

---

1. See above, pp. 45-47.

2. "Quis et unde?," p. 102.

3. Ibid., p. 101; also Dibelius, Tradition, p. 128.

slander; for this verse simply reveals why such a commentary is necessary. It is natural that such a revelation would be made at the very outset of the story. Similarly, the inclusion of the women in the preceding genealogy is not to be seen as part of such an apologetic response.[1] They simply anticipate the stupendous miracle the precise nature of which is disclosed for the first time in vs.18b. If extraordinary circumstances attended their participation in the royal-messianic line, how much more is this the case with Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ (vs.16)!

Krister Stendahl even considers the next verse as an expression of the Evangelist's apologetic interest:[2] Now Joseph her husband, being a righteous man (=δίκαιος) and not willing to expose her publicly, decided to divorce her privately. According to Stendahl, this aims at overcoming slanderous remarks by placing Joseph in the same attitude of suspicion. The suspicion is that Mary may have deceived her husband. It is questionable, however, whether this verse can bear the weight of such an interpretation. Joseph's suspicion is not emphasized. Although it is implied that his decision to divorce Mary is predicated on the mistaken belief that she had committed adultery, such is not explicitly stated. Therefore, Joseph does not seem to be cast in the role of Mary's alleged slanderers. In fact, what is stressed is Joseph's righteousness. He is a righteous man! As elsewhere in St. Matthew

---

1. Those who perceive in the mention of these women a reply to calumnies relative to the circumstances of Jesus' birth include the following: Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 30; Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 11; Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 52; and Stendahl, "Quis et unde?," pp. 101-102. Those who hold this view often see the wickedness of these four OT women as their common bond; but such would be a questionable apologetic for Mary's innocence. Those who deny any apologetic motive for naming the women in the genealogy include the following: Johnson, Matthew, pp. 251-52; Filson, Matthew, pp. 52-53; Allen, Matthew, pp. 2, 5; and Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 5.

2. "Quis et unde?," p. 102.

(so v.45; ix.13), here δίκαιος probably retains much of its OT-Jewish meaning. By contrast to the "sinner," the "righteous man" is one who does the will of God.[1] Among the Rabbis the man was reckoned "righteous" who could show one more instance of keeping the commandments than the number of transgressions.[2] According to the Matthaean text, however, Joseph's righteousness is not defined simply in terms of his keeping the law. Certainly in the decision to divorce Mary he acts in accordance with the law; but his righteousness is also defined in terms of his decision to divorce Mary privately rather than publicly. He is not insensitive to her feelings. Therefore, Joseph seems to be cast in the role of one who out of honest ignorance resolved to dismiss Mary his wife and one who exercised toward her all the restraint the law would allow. Who can find fault with Joseph's behavior? He is truly a righteous man! Interestingly enough, this snapshot of Joseph does not so much defend Mary against outspoken Jewish calumnies as guard Joseph from being misunderstood by Christians. He is not to be condemned for his resolution to divorce Mary the mother of the Messiah. The chief function vs.19 serves in the Matthaean context, however, is to set the stage for Joseph's confrontation with the Angel of the Lord.

If vs.18b reveals the reason why Jesus' entry into the Davidic line of descent calls for special comment, then vss.20-21, the address of the Angel of the Lord to Joseph, reveals how this entry is to be accomplished: "Joseph, Son of David, do not be afraid to take home Mary your wife. For the one having been conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. And she will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus; for he will save his people from their sins." The

---

1. Gerhard Barth presents a concise treatment of the Matthaean terms δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη in relationship to the significance of these terms within OT-Jewish thought, "Law," pp. 138ff.

2. Ibid., p. 139; also S-B, IV, p. 1037.

Angel of the Lord urges Joseph to take Mary for his wife, to adopt the child she carries in her womb, and thereby to make him a Davidic child. With regard to this engrafting of Jesus into the family of David two points are of utmost significance: the name Son of David and the command you shall call his name Jesus. That such an engrafting is the intention of the Evangelist is made clear by his having the Angel address Joseph as Son of David.[1] This is further evidence of the contrived overall unity of chapter one. Jesus can rightfully be called the Son of David (vs.1) only because Joseph as Son of David adopts him. This engrafting of Jesus into the Davidic family is finally sealed when Joseph having taken Mary home bestows upon her child the divinely revealed name: And he called his name Jesus (vs.25). Within the Matthaean account of Jesus' birth, therefore, it is not fortuitous that Joseph rather than Mary stands at center stage. This is in keeping with and required by the Evangelist's explication of Jesus' genealogical origins.

The Evangelist places his famous quotation of Isa.vii.14 immediately after the speech of the Angel of the Lord. This particular placement indicates that what the Evangelist deems to be of foremost importance in this story has already been said. It also underscores the significance of the speech of the Angel of the Lord in this regard. The Evangelist says: All this (= Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον) took place to fulfill that spoken by the Lord through the prophet: "Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel"--which means "God with us" (vss.22-23).

---

1. Only here in the NT is the phrase "son of David" used non-messianically or non-christologically. In the Lucan infancy narrative Joseph is "of the house of David" (i.27). The OT occasionally uses the phrase non-messianically (as 2 Sam.xiii.1; 1 Chr.xxix.22; 2 Chr.xi.18; xiii.6; Prov.i.1; and Eccl.i.1).

Among the ten Matthaean fulfilment formulas, only this formula begins with all this. The Evangelist, therefore, sees everything in the preceding narrative as having occurred so that Isa.vii.14 might be fulfilled. There do seem to be some obvious connections between that narrative and the OT citation. Diagrammatically they may be outlined thus:

. . . before they came together, she was found to be pregnant. . . .	"The virgin
For the one having been conceived in her. . . . And she shall bear a son	shall conceive and bear a son
. . . and you shall call his name Jesus; for he will save his people from their sins (vss.18b-21).	and they shall call his name Emmanuel"--which means "God with us" (vs.23=Isa.vii.14).

In spite of these connections between the narrative and the Isaianic oracle, however, and in spite of the fact that every word of that oracle has some counterpart in the narrative, much of that narrative has no counterpart in the oracle. The matter extraneous to the Isaianic prophecy includes the Holy Spirit as the agent of the virginal conception, Joseph's decision to divorce Mary his wife, and the overruling of that decision by the Angel of the Lord with his command to take home Mary, adopt her virginally conceived child, and thereby make him a Davidide. Nonetheless, all this happened so that Isa.vii.14 might be fulfilled. With this quotation, therefore, the First Evangelist demonstrates that the miraculous circumstances which necessitated Jesus the Messiah's engrafting into the Davidic stock as well as the way in which this engrafting was effected were foretold by the prophet. That the Messiah would be virgin born and a Davidide by adoption was part of God's plan from the beginning.

Few OT passages have evoked as much scholarly discussion as Isa.vii.

14.[1] As is well known, with the reading the virgin (= ἡ παρθένος) the Matthaean text follows the LXX rather than the MT (הָעַלְמָה, "the young woman"). This reading is necessary for the verse to have optimum interpretative value in relation to the story of Jesus' virginal birth. In its OT setting the verse is part of an oracle declared by Isaiah to King Ahaz and the house of David. Here (both in MT and in LXX) the reference is certainly not to the kind of virginal conception portrayed in St. Matthew;[2] and it is unlikely that Emmanuel is a messianic figure. Yet even if the verse constitutes a messianic prophecy in its OT context, it plays little or no role in the messianic speculation of later Judaism.[3] The Rabbis usually identify Emmanuel as Hezekiah the son of Ahaz.[4] Although this Isaianic prophecy has no well established history as a messianic prophecy, it has a definite history as a Davidic prophecy. In this respect, therefore, it is appropriate in the Matthaean context which focuses upon the engrafting of Jesus into the Davidic family.

Although acknowledging that the First Evangelist perceives multiple

---

1. A review of this debate is not germane to the present consideration of the use of this OT verse by the First Evangelist. But an extensive bibliography in this regard may be found in Joseph Coppens, "La prophétie d'Emmanuel," L'Attente du Messie ("Recherches Bibliques"; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954), pp. 39-41.

2. The OT makes no mention of the creative Holy Spirit which plays so important a role in the Matthaean interpretation of this verse. Furthermore, the LXX occasionally applies παρθένος to a woman who is no longer a virgin (as Gen.xxxiv.3).

3. According to some Qumran scholars, one of the Hymns (1QH iii.6ff) speaks about the birth of a messianic figure. So A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, translated by Geza Vermes from the second edition ("Meridian Books"; Cleveland-New York: The World Publishing Company, 1962), pp. 207-209. Significantly, however, this alleged messianic personage is called "Wonderful Counselor" rather than "Emmanuel." Thus the allusion is to Isa.ix.6 rather than to Isa.vii.14.

4. S-B, I, p. 75. Also see the discussion by S. L. Edgar, "New Testament and Rabbinic Messianic Interpretation," NTS, V (1958), 47-54.

connections between the story of Jesus' birth and the Isaianic citation, Krister Stendahl inquires as to precisely where in the citation he saw the main point. Concluding that the personal name Emmanuel constitutes that point, Stendahl writes:

> Then /the virgin shall conceive and bear a son/ would be the basis for the application of the title Immanuel, not the point itself. . . . And the title Immanuel underscores the messianic function of Jesus, who is to set his (!) people free from their sins. In short: the Immanuel prophecy substantiates the signifiance of the name Jesus as expressed in vs.21, an interesting and typically Matthean contrast to the easy conflation in Lk 1 31![1]

Undoubtedly Stendahl is correct in viewing the name Emmanuel as the cardinal point in the quotation. The translation of the name, which is left untranslated in the LXX, indicates that it is of particular importance to the Evangelist. He clearly wants his readers to understand its meaning. Furthermore, Stendahl is essentially correct in suggesting that the name Emmanuel underscores the messianic function of Jesus as expressed in vs.21. The previously outlined connections between the OT text and the narrative framework suggested this.[2] As the Emmanuel, the "God with us," Jesus will save his people from their sins. The relationship between the Emmanuel prophecy and the explanation of Jesus' name, however, is more complex than his formulation indicates. In more detail, the prophecy says, they shall call his name Emmanuel. The they shall call (= καλέσουσιν) differs from both the LXX and the MT (= καλέσεις and תִּקְרָא , "you shall call"). This Matthaean variant is certainly an intentional alteration of the OT text which arose in conjunction with its application to the conception, birth, and naming of Jesus. The change was prompted by the simple recognition that you (that is, Joseph in

---

1. "Quis et unde?," p. 103.

2. See above, p. 123.

the Matthaean context) did not call his name Emmanuel. But this change raises the question: who are they? In the Matthaean context the answer appears in the preceding explanation of Jesus name: he shall save his people from their sins. So his people, not Joseph, shall call his name Emmanuel. The recognition of the complexity of the relationship between the Emmanuel prophecy and the explanation of Jesus' name forces a series of insoluble problems upon the interpreter: does the First Evangelist alter the OT text to bring it into harmony with the birth story? Does he comment upon the name Jesus in order to explain the they of the OT citation? Both? Whatever the precise order in this matter, the Evangelist certainly sees a connection between the name Emmanuel and the definition of the name Jesus. Therefore, Stendahl is correct in his assertion that the name Emmanuel underscores the messianic function of Jesus as expressed in vs.21. But he still fails to grasp fully the import of the name Emmanuel for the First Evangelist.

The full significance of the name Emmanuel emerges only when one pursues more rigorously than has Stendahl the question of the "basis" for the application of this particular title to Jesus. Contrary to him, the initial portion of the Emmanuel prophecy, namely the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, does not form this basis. The basis for the application of the title Emmanuel to Jesus must be sought outside the verse itself in the preceding narrative material. Therein it is twice noted that Mary conceived Jesus of the Holy Spirit (vss. 18, 20). As observed earlier, the notion of divine generation by the Holy Spirit is foreign to the Isaianic oracle. That citation merely proclaims that the virgin shall conceive. The manner of that conception is not stated. Therefore, the idea of the creative power of the Holy Spirit serves as something of an exegetical principle for the interpretation of the prophetic text. This means that the real "basis" for the application of the

title Emmanuel to Jesus is his generation by the Spirit of God. The Angel of the Lord declares: "The one having been conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit" (vs.20). Because of his generation by the Holy Spirit, Jesus receives the name Emmanuel, that is "God with us." W. C. van Unnik expresses it similarly: "Because the unusual conception is the work of the Holy Spirit . . . Jesus was 'God with us'."[1]

The name Emmanuel, therefore, does not simply substantiate and point ahead to Jesus' messianic function. It also expresses and points back to his messianic origin. In fact, within the context of the story of Jesus' birth this is its logically prior reference. As the one conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of a virgin, Jesus is aptly designated Emmanuel, "God with us." In the Matthaean story of Jesus' birth, the miraculous conception of Jesus is not as theologically mute as Stendahl would suppose.[2] This divine intervention constitutes the basis of the application of the title Emmanuel to Jesus; and this name in turn refers back to Jesus' origin of the Holy Spirit. In this concluding section of the chapter (vss.18-25), the personal name Emmanuel serves to epitomize the Evangelist's interest in the origins of Jesus Christ.

Unlike the titles the Son of David and the Son of Abraham, however, the name Emmanuel is presented in such a way as to substantiate Jesus' messianic function as well as to indicate his messianic origin. Within the infancy traditions, therefore, this title has a two-fold reference which the others lack. The full significance of this usage of the name Emmanuel emerges

---

1. "Dominus Vobiscum," New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson 1893-1958, edited by A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: The University Press, 1959), p. 287.

2. "Quis et unde?," pp. 103-104.

only when the infancy traditions are viewed within the total context of the First Gospel. For the present, it will suffice to reiterate that the Evangelist sees a close relationship among Jesus' origin of the Holy Spirit (vss.18, 20), the name Emmanuel (vs.23), and his anticipated saving function (vs.21). That he does hold these three elements together is confirmed by the way in which he has inserted the Emmanuel prophecy into the story of Jesus' birth. He places that prophecy immediately after the address to Joseph by the Angel of the Lord. That address contains some five elements:

a. The command to take Mary home
b. The announcement of her conception of the Holy Spirit
c. The announcement of her son's impending birth
d. The command to give him the name Jesus
e. The explanation of the name Jesus

Following the Emmanuel prophecy the narrative conclusion to the story relates Joseph's obedience to the Angel of the Lord (vss.24-25). Therein only three of the aforementioned elements are repeated:

a. Joseph's obedience to the command to take Mary home
b. The birth of her son
c. Joseph's obedience to the command to give him the name Jesus

The two elements of the Angel of the Lord's speech which are not repeated are precisely those which report the two aspects of Jesus' person summed up in the name Emmanuel: his origin of the Holy Spirit and his saving function. This suggests that the Evangelist placed the Emmanuel prophecy immediately after the Angel's address to Joseph because he wanted to bring the name Emmanuel into close proximity with the announcement of Jesus' conception of the Holy Spirit (vs.20) and the explanation of Jesus' name (vs.21).

The affirmation that the title Emmanuel substantiates Jesus' messianic destiny as well as expressing his messianic origin, however, in no way compromises the contention that in this initial chapter the Evangelist is preeminently concerned with Jesus' genealogical origins. Within the general

treatment of Jesus' genealogical origins, he singles out the title enshrined within the Isaianic quotation as the name which most appropriately forms the link between these origins and his future saving work.

With chapter one, therefore, the Evangelist does set forth the genealogical origins of Jesus Christ. His origins not only provide him with the proper messianic credentials but establish his messiahship.

Jesus' genealogical origins are two-dimensional. On the one hand, Jesus falls heir to and fulfills the Abrahamic-Davidic line of descent. On the other hand, Jesus is conceived of the Holy Spirit. To view these two dimensions as human and divine respectively is to do an injustice to the thought of the First Evangelist. The former is no less of God than the latter. So perhaps these two dimensions can best be spoken of as paternal and maternal respectively. Through Joseph his adoptive father Jesus falls heir to and fulfills the Abrahamic-Davidic line of descent. Through Mary his virginal mother Jesus is conceived of the Holy Spirit. The very literary structure of chapter one reflects such a two-dimensional view of Jesus' genealogical origins. In vss.1-17 his Abrahamic-Davidic lineage is traced. The two titles the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (vs.1) epitomize Jesus' origin in this regard. Yet by the mention of the five women and the passive construction of whom was born (vs.16), this section anticipates the second dimension of Jesus' origins. In vss.18-25 his generation by the Holy Spirit is affirmed. The title Emmanuel (vs.23) epitomizes his origin in this regard. Yet by its superscription (vs.18a) and the ascription of the name Son of David (vs.20) to Joseph, this section points back to the genealogy. In fact, this section is interested in the engrafting of Jesus into the Davidic family. So Jesus is presented as the Son of David by adoption and Emmanuel by birth. Jesus the Messiah is the Davidic Emmanuel! According to the First Evangelist

this is in keeping with the foreordained divine purpose. The prophecy from Isa.vii.14 revealed that the Davidic Messiah would be born of a virgin and subsequently engrafted into the Davidic stock.

The geographical origins of Jesus Christ (chapter ii). With the second chapter, the Evangelist is still pre-eminently interested in what can appropriately be called Jesus' origins. But now these origins are of a somewhat different kind: geographical rather than genealogical! Krister Stendahl has cogently and convincingly argued that the geographical names of this chapter constitute what is really important to the First Evangelist.[1] The principal task of what follows, therefore, is the confirmation of and an elaboration upon his basic thesis.

Geographical names do dominate the narrative portions of the second chapter. The chapter opens with this note: Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea . . . (vs.1). The full significance of this reference to Bethlehem as the site of Jesus' birth emerges only when it is viewed in the light of the preceding account of that birth (i.18-25). Therein absolutely no mention is made of the place of Jesus' birth. The residence of Joseph and Mary is not designated. In fact, this story contains no geographical notes of any kind. This absence of geographical names, of course, stems from the preoccupation of the story with Jesus' genealogical ties. Only with the second chapter are his geographical connections of any concern; and the immediate reference to Bethlehem is the first indication that they are the major concern. The chapter concludes with this narrative comment: . . . and he went and settled in a village called Nazareth (vs.23). So the entire chapter is placed within "geographical

---

1. "Quis et unde?," pp. 97ff.

brackets." Within this framework are numerous geographical references: Jerusalem (vss.1, 3), Bethlehem of Judea (vs.5), Bethlehem (vs.7), Egypt (vss. 13, 14), Bethlehem (vs.16), Egypt (vs.19), the Land of Israel (vss.20, 21), Judea (vs.22), and Galilee (vs.22). The Herodian fear and hatred of the child Jesus is indeed the driving force behind the events of this chapter;[1] but the events precipitated by this antagonism are decidedly geographical in kind: the journey of the astrologers to Bethlehem (vss.1-12), the escape of Jesus with his family to Egypt (vss.13-15), the visit of the murderers to Bethlehem (vss.16-18), and the return of Jesus with his family from Egypt through Judea to the Galilean village of Nazareth (vss.19-23).

That these geographical names do constitute what is of primary importance to the First Evangelist is further supported by two observations of a comparative nature.

Firstly, the numerous geographical names in the second chapter are thrown into relief by the relative absence of specific temporal notes. In contradistinction to the Lucan birth account, the entire Matthaean infancy story is characterized by a lack of specific references to time.[2] In the first chapter, the story of Jesus' birth does not state when he was born. The omission reflects that chapter's interest in Jesus' genealogical ties. The narrative complex of the second chapter does occasionally make temporal remarks (as vss.1, 15, 19). But they are quite general and made only where required for the overall narrative, indeed geographical, movement of the chapter. This general absence of temporal references, therefore, stems from

---

1. See above, p. 75.

2. See above, pp. 99-101.

the chapter's preoccupation with Jesus' geographical connections.

Secondly, the numerous geographical names in the second chapter are thrown into relief by the relative absence of personal names applicable to Jesus. The interest of the First Evangelist in the initial chapter in the genealogical origins of Jesus is epitomized by such personal names as the Son of David, the Son of Abraham, and Emmanuel. The second chapter implicitly affirms both Jesus' Davidic origin and his origin of the Holy Spirit. The Davidic origin of Jesus is implied by his birth in David's town--Bethlehem (vs.1).[1] As the King of the Jews (vs.2; compare i.6), Jesus is the true successor to David's throne. Jesus' origin of the Holy Spirit is implied by the way in which the narrative describes his relationship to his parents. The Magi saw the child with Mary his mother (vs.11). When Joseph embarks upon a journey, he takes the child and his mother (vss.13, 14, 20, 21). Any wording that might suggest that Joseph is the natural father of the infant Jesus is scrupulously avoided. In spite of such pointers to Jesus' genealogical origins, the titles of the first chapter which epitomize those origins are not repeated in the second chapter. In fact, the only honorific names used with reference to Jesus in the narrative portions of the latter chapter are the King of the Jews (vs.2) and the Christ (vs.4). Elsewhere Jesus is consistently referred to as the child (= τὸ παιδίον , vss. 8, 9, 11, 13, 13, 14, 20, 20, 21).[2] So the relative absence of personal titles tends to throw into relief the numerous

---

1. 1 Sam.xvi.1, xvii.12, xx.6; 2 Sam.xxiii.14ff.

2. Ernst Lohmeyer sees preserved in the Matthaean infancy account a view of Jesus as the Servant of God, Gottesknecht und Davidssohn (2nd ed., "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," n.s. 43; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), pp. 40-46. It is questionable, however, whether or not the repeated usage of this τὸ παιδίον can be used to support this. In vs.16 the masculine plural τοὺς παῖδας is used to designate the children slain in Bethlehem.

geographical names.

The literary analysis of Matthew i-ii concluded that for the composition of the second chapter the First Evangelist had access to a body of oral tradition which is now preserved in vss.1-21. Already associated with the appropriate episodes were the OT citations from Micah v.2, Hos.xi.1, and Jer.xxxi.15. The Evangelist wrote up this material in such a way as to form four narrative LITERARY UNITS each of which contained an introductory formula-OT citation cluster. To achieve this he added the matter now represented by vss.22-23. That which affords the final confirmation of the Evangelist's interest in the geographical origins of Jesus is his use of the formula citations to substantiate the key points in the itinerary that runs throughout the chapter.

The initial episode (vss.1-12) involves the Eastern Magi who come to Jerusalem asking, "Where is he who has been born King of the Jews?"(vs.2). Hearing of their search, King Herod passes the question on to the chief priests and scribes of the people asking where the Messiah is to be born (vs.4). In response the congregated religious leaders say: "At Bethlehem of Judea; for so it is written by the prophet, 'And you, O Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, you are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for out of you will come a ruler who will shepherd my people Israel'" (Micah v.2=vss.5-6).

The primary connection between the OT citation and the narrative framework is quite clear. The Bethlehem of the citation repeats the Bethlehem in the answer of the chief priests and scribes. The Magi and Herod ask geographical questions. These knowledgeable persons offer a geographical answer. One of the peculiar features of the Matthaean form of the text reinforces such a usage of the quotation. St. Matthew reads in the land of Judah (= γῆ Ἰούδα). But the LXX (B) reads "house of Ephrathah" (= οἶκος Ἐφράθα);

and the MT has just "Ephrathah" (= אֶפְרָתָה). So the Matthaean reading tightens the geographical relationship between the OT citation and the preceding narrative which has of Judea (=τῆς Ἰουδαίας).

Among the Matthaean fulfilment quotations this citation from Micah v.2 is unique on two counts.[1] Firstly, only it lacks the customary fulfilment formula. Secondly, appearing on the lips of the Jewish religious leaders, only it does not stand as a clear editorial commentary on the Gospel story. No doubt the latter explains the former. The quotation lacks the usual fulfilment formula precisely because it is verbalized by the Jewish leaders who see no fulfilment. Yet the question remains: why does the First Evangelist elect to retain or place this quotation on the lips of the chief priests and the scribes? Krister Stendahl is probably essentially correct in his suggestion that this is in recognition of the fact that the emergence of the Messiah from Bethlehem was a common assumption within Jewish messianism.[2] Certainly according to the NT, such a belief was a part of Jewish messianic expectation.[3] Also the Rabbis pointed to Bethlehem as the place from which the Davidic Messiah would come; and they interpreted this Micah prophecy messianically.[4] Yet there seems to be more involved in this use of the Jewish

---

1. See above, p. 36, n. 1.

2. "Quis et unde?," p. 100.

3. Especially, Jn.vii.40-43; also Lk.i-ii.

4. S-B, I, 82ff. Edgar, "NT and Rabbinic Messianic Interpretation," pp. 47-54. It is problematical whether or not the Rabbinic sources preserve traditions which were prevalent in the first century. But Werner Förster attributes the scarcity and lateness of the evidence with regard to the Bethlehem tradition to the Rabbis' suppression of messianic texts and sayings in the dispute with Christianity, Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times, translated by Gordon E. Harris (Edinburgh-London: Oliver and Boyd, 1964), p. 199. The root of this tradition, of course, extends back into the OT's recognition of Bethlehem as the home of David and his family (1 Sam.xvi.1; Ruth i.22, et al.) The OT and the intertestamental literature, however, call Jerusalem the "city of David" (2 Chr.v.2, xxxiii.14; I Macc.i.33, ii.31,

leaders as the mouthpiece for this citation. Perhaps in part this "more" is suggested by the way in which the Evangelist's presentation of this Magi story parallels his treatment of the genealogy (i.1-17). He introduces that table of descent with the affirmation of Jesus as the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (vs.1). Thereby he endows Jesus with the proper messianic qualifications with regard to his lineage. Then with the schematic genealogy he demonstrates Jesus' messiahship (vss.2-16). By simply referring to the Christ (vs.17) rather than to Jesus by name in the summary statement, he allows the reader to draw the self-evident equation the Christ=Jesus. Similarly, the Magi pericope begins with the affirmation that Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea (vs.1). Thereby Jesus is implicitly handed his messianic credentials with regard to his place of birth. But here he is not overtly designated as the Messiah. No honorific title is bestowed upon him. After this fleeting mention of Jesus' birthplace, the scene immediately shifts to Jerusalem. The events there lead up to Herod's inquiry relative to the birthplace of the Messiah (vs.4). Appealing to scripture, the Jewish leaders point to Bethlehem of Judea (vs.5) as the birthplace of the Messiah. This recalls vs.1 and invites the reader himself to make the obvious equation the Christ=Jesus. In this way, the second chapter also opens with something of a demonstration of Jesus' messiahship. By its very nature, this demonstration constitutes a polemic against the Jews. Commentators often question whether or not all the chief priests and the scribes of the people (vs.4) is intended to indicate a formal

---

xiv.36 et al.); for Jerusalem was the city David transformed into his royal capital. But St. Luke recognizes Bethlehem as the "city of David" (ii.4, 11).

gathering of the Sanhedrin.[1] But however one resolves this problem, the point of the Matthaean passage is clear: Herod summons the leaders of the Jews who should know the answer to his query of the Messiah's birthplace. So ironically, those who point to Bethlehem of Judea (vs.5) as the site of the Messiah's emergence do not recognize him when he appears there. Instead, the scripturally ignorant Easterners seek him out and eventually worship him (vs.11).

In conclusion, therefore, the quotation from Micah v.2 is certainly used to substantiate Jesus' birth in Bethlehem; and it is employed in such a way as to demonstrate his messiahship. As noted, the only two honorific titles granted Jesus in the entire second chapter appear in this introductory pericope: the King of the Jews (vs.2) and the Christ (vs.4). The significance of this now appears. They are used in conjunction with the OT prophecy in the argumentation for Jesus' messiahship.

In the next scene (vss.13-15), the Angel of the Lord bids Joseph to flee into Egypt with his family to save the child from the clutches of the vengeful Herod and to remain there until Herod's death. Following the narration of Joseph's obedience to the Angel of the Lord's command, the Evangelist comments: This was to fulfill what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (Hos.xi.1=vs.15b-c). Again the primary connection between the OT citation and the narrative setting is

---

1. The problem is created by the absence of the elders who along with the chief priests and scribes constitute the Great Council. Those who perceive in the Matthaean reference a formal gathering of the entire Sanhedrin include: Gaechter, Matthäus, p. 62; and Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 15. Among those opposing this view and maintaining that only an informal gathering of some of its members is meant are the following: Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 26; Johnson, Matthew, p. 258; and Plummer, Matthew, p. 13.

self-evident. The Egypt in the formula citation repeats the twice mentioned Egypt (vss.13, 14) of that context.

Krister Stendahl observes that the placement of this OT oracle in the Matthaean infancy narrative indicates that the Evangelist is interested in geographical location rather than "event."[1] The point is well taken since the prophecy is inserted where Egypt is mentioned for the first time (vss.13, 14) rather than where the actual call out of Egypt takes place (vss.19ff). But the Evangelist could still have placed the OT citation where the call took place for geographical reasons. So the question remains: why does the Evangelist elect to insert the prophecy where Egypt is mentioned for the first time? This is necessary for the overall structure of his geographical exposition. He intends to use the highly significant Nazarene quotation as the structure building element for the narration of the last leg of Jesus' journey from Bethlehem to Nazareth (vss.19ff).

It is quite possible that in the oral transmission and retelling of the events of vss.13-21 the Hosea prophecy was commonly associated with the material in vss.19-21. This is suggested by the fact that both the Hosea citation and the material in vss.19-21 reflect the New Exodus motif. In its OT (MT) context, this prophecy recalls Yahweh's deliverance of Israel, his "son," from Egypt. By the unparalleled application of this verse to an individual, to Jesus the Messiah,[2] the pre-Matthaean interpreter portrayed Jesus as recapitulating in his person the Exodus experience of Israel. As observed,

---

1. "Quis et unde?," p. 97.

2. Such an individualized or messianic interpretation of Hos.xi.1 has no counterpart in Rabbinic exegesis. See S-B, I, 85-88, and Edgar, "NT and Rabbinic Messianic Interpretation," pp. 47-54.

the material of vss.19-21 was probably a pre-Matthaean expansion of the original nucleus of vss.13-18 prompted partly by the desire to bring the New Exodus motif into greater prominence.[1] Therefore, the citation from Hos.xi.1 is more appropriately associated with vss.19-21; and perhaps prior to the writing up of the traditions by the First Evangelist it was commonly connected to the traditions at this point. This would mean that in placing the OT citation where Egypt is first mentioned the Evangelist departs from the usual practice in this regard. Admittedly this discussion is quite speculative; and its veracity or falsity in no way affects the basic contention with regard to the First Evangelist's usage of this formula citation from Hos.xi.1. He uses it to substantiate Egypt as the place of Jesus' exile.

The third scene of the second chapter (vss.16-18) depicts Herod's slaughter in Bethlehem of the children who were two years of age and under. After the reporting of this grisly occurrence, the Evangelist says: Then was fulfilled what was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, "A voice was heard in Ramah, wailing and loud lamentation; Rachel weeping for her children, and she refused to be comforted for they were no more"(Jer.xxxi.15=vss.17-18).

Unlike the formula citations from Micah v.2 and Hos.xi.1, this citation does not immediately seem to possess a geographical connection with its narrative framework. Firstly, although the citation contains a geographical name, Ramah, that name varies from the locale of the massacre, Bethlehem (vs.16). Secondly, the picture of Rachel's wailing for her children seems so appropriate in this setting that "event" rather than geography seems to be the dominant if not the exclusive concern of the Jeremiah citation. Certainly the portrait of Rachel's lamentation is quite appropriate in this context.

---

1. See above, pp. 80-81.

But this does not mean that the prophecy is not used geographically.[1] In fact, two further observations indicate that the First Evangelist uses this quotation to substantiate the slaughter in Bethlehem. Firstly, Jewish literature attests two different, conflicting traditions regarding the burial place of Rachel. On the one hand, there is the report of her having been interred north of Jerusalem "in the territory of Benjamin at Zelzah" (1 Sam.x.2). Ramah is in Benjamin and thus Jer.xxxi.15 reflects this tradition. This is an appropriate place for her burial insofar as she was the mother of Benjamin. Perhaps this indicates that this is the older tradition. On the other hand, there is the report of her having been buried "on the way to Ephrath (that is, Bethlehem)" (Gen.xxxv.19; xlviii.7; also Jub.xxxii.34; Jos., Ant.I.xxi.3). The evidence for this tradition suggests that by the first century it was in the ascendancy. It is probable, therefore, that the First Evangelist equated Ramah with Bethlehem. S. L. Edgar is essentially correct when he says that "Matthew chooses . . . to identify Ramah with Bethlehem, and is thus able to apply this verse to the later event which occurred there, the Massacre of the Innocents."[2] Secondly, the LXX (A, ℵ*) and Aquila suppress the mention of

---

1. Particularly instructive in this regard is the OT citation from Micah v.2 preserved in vs.6. The First Evangelist clearly sees Bethlehem as the primary connection between that citation and its narrative setting. He uses it to substantiate Bethlehem as the site of Jesus' birth. Yet the quotation itself is highly appropriate for the larger setting into which it has been inserted. This appropriateness is underlined by the fact that the Matthaean form of the citation is the result of something of a conflation between Micah v.2 and 2 Sam.v.2. The influence of the latter is reflected in the closing words: . . . a ruler who will shepherd my people Israel. In the OT the shepherd image represents the king and eventually the Davidic ruler who will reign in the restored kingdom (so 2 Sam.v.2; Jer.xxiii.1-3; Ezek.xxxiv.2ff, et al.; also Pss.Sol.xvii.40ff). How appropriate this conflated citation is in a story which speaks of Jesus as the King of the Jews!

2. "NT and Rabbinic Messianic Interpretation," p. 52, n.1. On the identification Ramah-Ephrath-Bethlehem as it relates to the traditions of Rachel's burial place, see Joachim Jeremias, Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt. (Mt.23, 29; Lk.11, 47). Eine Untersuchung zur Volksreligion der Zeit Jesu (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), pp. 75-76.

Ramah in Jer.xxxi.15; for ἐν Ραμὰ they read ἐν τῇ ὑψηλῇ .[1] By the first century, therefore, there seems to be a fairly well established tradition for omitting Ramah. Perhaps this suppression is a further indication of the triumph of the Bethlehem tradition with regard to the burial place of Rachel. At any rate, it seems likely that if in the pre-Matthaean (or even Matthaean) application of the Jeremiah quotation to the story of the Bethlehem massacre Ramah was not equated with Bethlehem, then the mention of Ramah would similarly have been suppressed.

So the First Evangelist does use the Jeremiah prophecy to substantiate the slaughter of the children in Bethlehem.

With the final scene (vss.19-23), this chapter draws to a conclusion with a veritable "geographical crescendo." Jesus along with his family moves from Egypt to the land of Israel through Judea to the region of Galilee and the small town of Nazareth. According to the First Evangelist: This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophets that he shall be called a Nazarene (vs.23b-c).

Whatever the origin of the name Nazarene,[2] the First Evangelist under-

---

1. See Stendahl, "Quis et unde?," p. 97.

2. The problem of the origin of the name Nazarene is complicated by the presence in the NT of two different spellings: Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος. With the exception of its appearance at Lk.iv.34 and xxiv.19, the former spelling is confined to St. Mark (four times). But the latter spelling appears in St. Luke (one time), St. Matthew (two times), St. John (three times), and Acts (seven times). Except for its usage in the phrase "the Sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv.5), the name Nazarene is used with reference to Jesus. Several suggestions have been made as to its origin. Among these suggestions are the following: (1) In both of its forms, the name Nazarene is derived from the name of the town Nazareth. That this is philologically possible has been demonstrated in some detail by George Foot Moore, "Nazarene and Nazareth," The Beginnings of Christianity, edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (3 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-26), I, 426-32. For further support of Moore's thesis, see W. F. Albright, "The Names 'Nazareth' and 'Nazoraean'," JBL, LXV (1946), pp. 397-401. But compare Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946),

stands it geographically.[1] Jesus is called a Nazarene because he hails from Nazareth. Such is the relationship between this final formula citation and its narrative setting. It substantiates the eventual settlement of the Bethlehem-born Jesus with his family in the Galilean town of Nazareth. If Bethlehem is the city of David, Nazareth becomes the city of Jesus.

In order to present the name Nazarene (=Ναζωραῖος) in the form of an OT citation, however, the First Evangelist resorts to wordplay upon the "Nazirite" (=Ναζιραῖος) of the OT (LXX A, Judg.xiii.5, 7; xvi.7).[2] These OT passages involve Samson the great Nazirite from early in Israel's history. By using Nazarene as he does, however, the Evangelist is not interested in draping Jesus with the mantle of a Nazirite. He has recourse to such a word-play only because it is necessary for the presentation of Nazarene as an indirect OT quotation, and thus for his employment of this constructed citation to substantiate Jesus' settlement at Nazareth.

In this concluding pericope, the geographical interest of the Evangelist really comes to the fore; for it seems that he is the one responsible for all the material in vss.22-23.[3] He makes these remarks in order to introduce Nazareth as Jesus' home. With the arrival at Nazareth Jesus' journey

---

pp. 143-46. (2) In both of its forms the name Nazarene has its roots in a view of Jesus as a Nazirite (= נָזִיר). So F. C. Burkitt, "The Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names," Proceedings of the British Academy, V (1911-12), 393-94. (3) In both of its forms the name Nazarene is derived from the name of a pre-Christian Jewish sect, perhaps the sect comprised of the followers of John the Baptist. So Mark Lidzbarski, Mandäische Liturgien (Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920), p. xvif. Also consult Black, Aramaic Approach, pp. 143-46.

1. Elsewhere in St. Matthew, the name Nazarene appears only at Mt.xxvi.71. Here it is also viewed geographically (compare Mk.xiv.67).

2. See above, pp. 88-90.

3. See above, pp. 86-88.

reaches its God-ordained destination.

Krister Stendahl is correct. The common denominator for all four formula citations is that they contain geographical names. The Evangelist uses them to substantiate Bethlehem, Egypt, Bethlehem, and Nazareth in the itinerary of the second chapter. Furthermore, Stendahl is correct in looking to Jn.vii.41f as preserving the kind of questions that would have necessitated an explication of Jesus' geographical origins: "Others said, 'This is the Christ.' But some said, 'Is the Christ to come from Galilee? Has not the scripture said that the Christ is descended from David and comes from Bethlehem, the village where David was?'" The First Evangelist, therefore, shows how God guided and directed Joseph with his family from Bethlehem to Nazareth. The eventual emergence of the Messiah from the Galilean town of Nazareth was part of God's plan for the Messiah. The scriptures clearly prove this. It must be said, however, that the title Stendahl would place over this chapter needs to be slightly revised. He calls the chapter: "How it came to pass that the Messiah came from Nazareth." More appropriately, it should be called: "How it came to pass that the Messiah born in Bethlehem came from Nazareth." An important concern of the chapter is to establish his birth in Bethlehem as well as to explain how he came from Nazareth. This is seen, above all else, in the way in which the portrayal of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem is used as a demonstration of his messiahship. In the second chapter, therefore, the Evangelist is pre-eminently concerned with Jesus' geographical origins.

. The triumph of Davidic messianism.[1] The unrealized Jewish hope for a Davidic Messiah involved two beliefs or assumptions with regard to the origins of that messianic figure. On the one hand, that messianic figure would be of Davidic lineage. On the other hand, he would come from David's village of Bethlehem. The aforementioned verses from Jn.vii.41f give expression to these related beliefs.

According to the traditions of the primitive Church, Jesus satisfied both requirements for Davidic messiahship. He was of the Davidic family.[2] He was born in Bethlehem.[3] But according to the tradition of the early Church, there were also other aspects of Jesus' origins that were not anticipated by the ideology of Jewish messianism. He was conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of a virgin.[4] He hailed from Nazareth of Galilee and conducted

---

1. Broadly defined, messianism is Jewish eschatological expectation which included the hope for a future redeemer figure. Typologically, Davidic messianism can be viewed in one of two ways. Firstly, as a more general category it can be viewed as that kind of messianism whose expectation looked for a human redeemer figure. From this perspective, Davidic messianism stands in marked contrast to Son of Man messianism. The latter looked for a supernatural, heavenly redeemer figure (as in I Enoch). For such a delineation of these two basic strands within Jewish messianism, consult the following: Sigmund Mowinckel, He that Cometh, translated by G. W. Anderson (New York-Nashville: Abingdom Press, 1956), pp. 280-84; and Howard M. Teeple, "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology," JBL, LXXXIV (1965), 213-16. As part of the evidence for the distinction between the Son of David and the Son of Man within early Christian tradition, Teeple states: "The distinction between the two titles is shown also by the facts that there is no genealogy of the Son of Man (how could there be, since he is a pre-existent being?) and that his title does not appear in the birth stories," ibid., p. 214. Secondly, as a more restricted category, Davidic messianism can be viewed as that kind of messianism whose expectation looked for a human redeemer figure of Davidic lineage. From this perspective, Davidic messianism stands in contrast with the hope for a messianic personage of Levitic, Aaronic, or Ephraimic lineage. The messianism reflected in Matthew i-ii is Davidic on both counts.

2. Mt.i-ii; Mk.x.47f; Lk.i-ii, xviii.38f; Acts ii.30ff, xiii.23; Rom.i.3; Heb.vii.14; 2 Tim.ii.18; Rev.v.5, xxiii.16.

3. Mt.i-ii; Lk.i-ii.

4. Mt.i-ii; Lk.i-ii.

much of his ministry in that northern province.[1] Within the early Church, therefore, circulated a rather diverse tradition relative to the origins of Jesus. Certain aspects of this tradition were potentially at odds with one another. How is Jesus of Davidic descent and born of a virgin? How is Bethlehem his birthplace yet Nazareth his home? Some kind of détente was required among the various facets of this tradition.

This is what the Matthaean infancy account is all about. Aware of Jesus' Davidic ancestry, the virginal conception, his Bethlehem birth, and his residence in Nazareth, the Evangelist works this tradition into a coherent and consistent whole.

Among others, Krister Stendahl has stressed the apologetic interest operative in the Evangelist's explication of the origins of Jesus Christ. Although the Evangelist is probably not replying to specific slander directed at Mary, he is no doubt writing with one eye on the non-believing Jews of his day. This is quite evident in other parts of his Gospel;[2] and the way in which he strives to prove the messiahship of Jesus both by the schematic arrangement of the genealogy and, more particularly, by his use of the Magi story suggests that such is the case in the infancy account. Nonetheless, first and foremost the Evangelist is concerned with questions forced upon him by the tradition itself: From whom? From where? Within this tradition were several competing answers. He attempts to bring some kind of order out of comparative disorder. Since he is primarily motivated by questions arising from the tradition itself, the Evangelist offers what might be termed a dogmatic (rather than apologetic) and scriptural answer.

---

1. Mt.i-ii; Mk.i.9; Lk.i-ii, iv.6; et al.

2. In this regard, see the rather detailed discussion by W. D. Davies, Sermon on the Mount, pp. 286-315.

That which is most intriguing is the way in which he brings order out of comparative disorder with regard to the origins of Jesus Christ. He demonstrates that Jesus is truly the Davidic Messiah and that all circumstances surrounding Jesus' origins were prophesied concerning this messianic personage. To accomplish this he proceeds with great care and forethought. With the first chapter, the Evangelist focuses upon Jesus' genealogical ties and answers the question: From whom? He not only shows that Jesus possesses the necessary credentials for Davidic messiahship but also establishes by means of the orderly arrangement of the genealogy that he is the Davidic Messiah. He uses the prophecy from Isa.vii.14 to prove that the virginal conception of the Davidic scion was ordained by God from the beginning. With the second chapter, the Evangelist focuses upon Jesus' geographical connections and answers the question: From where? He not only shows that Jesus fulfills the requirements for Davidic Messiahship but also establishes by means of the Magi episode that he is the Davidic Messiah. He employs the prophecies of Hos.xi.1 and Jer.xxxi.15 and the Nazarene quotation to prove that the movement of the Davidic Messiah from Bethlehem was planned by God from the beginning.

With the Matthaean infancy account, Davidic messianism has triumphed. The Evangelist begins each of his chapters with the simple affirmation that Jesus fulfills one of the two basic qualifications required of the Davidic Messiah. He is the Son of David (i.1) and born in Bethlehem (ii.1). He does not simply harmonize these aspects of Jesus' origins with the other known details of those origins such as the virginal conception and his residence in Nazareth; but rather he demonstrates that these details were also expected of the Davidic Messiah. And Jesus Christ is he!

Chapter III

MATTHEW I-II, THE FIRST GOSPEL, AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE FIRST EVANGELIST

The appropriate point of departure for a consideration of the relationship between the Matthaean infancy account and the rest of the Gospel is the recognition of the fact that the First Evangelist not only prefaces his revision of St. Mark with the infancy traditions but also appends certain resurrection traditions to that revision.[1] The First Evangelist's re-presentation of St. Mark, therefore, takes place within a non-Marcan framework.

The following examination of this non-Marcan framework (especially of the concluding pericope) will also involve a rather lengthy consideration of several motifs and themes in the body of the Gospel.

The Gospel of St. Mark concludes with a single brief resurrection episode in which the Resurrected One himself does not appear (xvi.1-8). As the curtain falls upon the scene, frightened women flee from the empty tomb

---

1. The hypothesis of Marcan priority has been recently called into question by such scholars as William R. Farmer, The Synoptic Problem: a Critical Analysis (New York: Macmillan, 1964). But as stated in the Introduction, this study still assumes the priority of St. Mark. Furthermore, the following discussion of the First Evangelist's treatment of the Marcan resurrection narrative assumes that the copy of St. Mark with which he was familiar ended with xvi.8. Occasionally, however, the suggestion is made that the First Evangelist worked with a copy of St. Mark which still contained its "lost ending." For example, see W. C. Allen, Matthew, pp. 302-03. But to maintain such a hypothesis is to establish one conjecture upon a previous conjecture, namely that the Marcan Gospel at one time possessed a "lost ending."

bearing the angel's message that Jesus would appear to his disciples in Galilee.

Having reworked this Marcan story, the First Evangelist then adds an appearance of the Resurrected One before the fleeing women (xxviii.9-10), the apologetic legend about the deceit of the chief priests (xxviii.11-15), and at last the actual appearance of the Resurrected One before the eleven disciples in Galilee (xxviii.16-20). In spite of its references to the fraudulent activity of the chief priests (xxviii.2-4, 11-15; also xxvii.62-66), the whole Matthaean resurrection account moves toward the final scene and the manifestation of the Resurrected One in Galilee (xxviii.16-20).[1] To the startled women the angel said: "Then go quickly and tell his disciples that . . . he is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him" (xxviii.7). Jesus himself reiterated this command: "Go and tell my brethren to go to Galilee, and there they will see me" (xxviii.10). And finally the promised manifestation takes place:

> Now the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain to which Jesus had directed them. And when they saw him they worshipped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came and said to them, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (xxviii.16-20).

No doubt behind this episode lies a tradition of a resurrection appearance in Galilee (as Jn.xxi; but compare Lk.xxiv; Jn.xx) which was orally

---

1. So Hugh Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins: a Commentary on Modern Viewpoints (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 223, and Ernst Lohmeyer, "'Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt!' Eine exegese von Mt.28, 16-20," In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer, edited by Werner Schmauch (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk GmbH., 1951), pp. 22ff.

transmitted to the First Evangelist.[1] The mention of the mountain (=τὸ ὄρος) creates something of a difficulty insofar as the earlier references to this Galilean manifestation do not designate a mountain as the precise place of manifestation (xxvi.32, xxviii.7, 10). Yet this mention of the mountain is not due to the First Evangelist's inadequate assimilation of oral tradition.[2] Whether derived from oral tradition or the hand of the Evangelist, it is consonant with his practice of designating a mountain as the place of revelation (as v.1, viii.1, xv.29, xvii.1, xxiv.3).[3] As elsewhere in the Gospel, therefore, so here in the concluding pericope the mountain is as much a theological as a geographical category.[4] As a resurrection appearance story, this final narrative is to be reckoned as belonging to the type of resurrection appearance account whose focal point is the mission command of the Resurrected One to his disciples (as Lk.xxiv.44-49; Acts i.4-8; Jn.xx.19-23).[5]

---

1. Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 49. Also see the remarks by Günther Bornkamm, "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische: Mt 28, 16-20," Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag, edited by Erich Dinkler (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck, 1964), p. 171.

2. This explanation is advanced by Pierre Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 417.

3. Lohmeyer, "Mt.28, 16-20," pp. 23-24. Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 171.

4. With regard to the possibility of seeing in this reference to the mountain a possible allusion to Jesus as the New Moses, W. D. Davies asserts: "We must, therefore, conclude that in the Epilogue [xxvi.1-xxviii.20] the New Moses motif cannot be regarded as in any way determinative or influential. Traces of it are uncertain and conjectural; such cogency as they possess is confined to xxviii.16-20 and is no more than suggestive, and rests on indications of the New Moses motif which may have emerged elsewhere in the Gospel, not in its own right," Sermon on the Mount, p. 86.

5. Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 171.

The Exaltation of Jesus

Although Mt.xxviii.16ff is a resurrection story, the First Evangelist presents it as much more than a resurrection account.[1] The actual appearance of Jesus is briefly dismissed in a participial clause: and when they saw him (= καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν , vs.17). This curt dismissal of the manifestation throws the emphasis upon the words of Jesus which follow (vss.18b-20). Significantly, Otto Michel perceives in these words what Joachim Jeremias calls a "triple-action coronation text": (1) the assumption of all authority by the Resurrected One (vs.18b); (2) the command to proclaim his authority among all nations (vss.19-20a); and (3) the word of power (vs.20b).[2] This pattern has its ultimate roots in such coronation rites as that exemplified by the ancient Egyptian royal ritual.[3] So the Resurrected One is elevated to his throne. Furthermore, following these words of Jesus there is no mention of his departure. The First Gospel, therefore, remains open to the future. This openness is acknowledged and affirmed in Jesus' closing statement: "And behold, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (vs.20b). The Resurrected One is the Exalted One! This final resurrection story is an exaltation story! And presumably, therefore, Jesus' resurrection is his exaltation! With this final pericope the First Evangelist spans the time and distance between that Galilean mountain and his own community. The you is no longer just the eleven

---

1. Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 171. Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, p. 224.

2. Michel, "Der Abschluss der Matthäusevangeliums," EvTh, X (1950-51), pp. 16-26. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, translated by S. H. Hooke ("Studies in Biblical Theology"; London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 39. This schema has NT parallels in such hymn-like texts as 1 Tim.iii.16, Phil.ii.9-11, and Heb.i.5-14.

3. Karl Heinrich Rengsdorf sees in Mt.xxviii.18ff the influence of such OT texts as Ps.ii.8. Insofar as this Psalm was probably used in the coronation of the Judean Kings, he discovers here in these closing verses of St. Matthew traces of the Judean coronation ritual. See his "Old and New Testament Traces of a Formula of the Judean Royal Ritual," NT, V (1962), 229-44.

but the many of his community.

It is from this perspective that the phrase some doubted (= οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν , vs.17) is to be understood.[1] In its Matthaean context the some refers to a number among the eleven. No outsiders are present on the mountain.[2] The recognition of doubt among the eleven is not confined to St. Matthew. Their incredulity is a common motif in many of the resurrection narratives (Mk.xvi.14; Lk.xxiv.41; also Jn.xx.24ff). The report of the doubt in these latter passages, however, serves a function somewhat different from the mention of doubt in the Matthaean story. In St. Mark the disciples refuse to believe the testimony of those who have beheld the Resurrected One. But having seen for themselves they believe. In St. Luke although the disciples see the Resurrected One they still cling to their unbelief. Only his eating a piece of broiled fish elicits their complete trust. In St. John it is Thomas who doubts. His scepticism is overcome by the Resurrected One's invitation to touch his wounds. In each of these instances, incredulity is transformed into credulity by an immediate sensible relationship to the Resurrected One. Therein the report of the doubt serves to strengthen the proof of the resurrection insofar as such proof is mediated by sight and touch. But in St. Matthew neither sight nor touch dissipates the doubt of the disciples. In fact, no explicit mention is made of the resolution of their unbelief. But such is implied by the way in which the reference to their doubt is immediately followed by the pronouncement of Jesus. In St.

---

1. The following discussion of this phrase is greatly indebted to the observations of Gerhard Barth, "Law," pp. 132-133.

2. Occasionally it is maintained that this some designates persons other than the eleven: Allen, Matthew, p. 303. But for the opposite viewpoint see the following: Filson, Matthew, p. 305; Johnson, Matthew, p. 621; and Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 418.

Matthew that which conquers the uncertainty of the disciples is the word of Jesus! This report of the disciples' doubt reflects the situation of the post-resurrection Matthaean community among whose members are those who seek a certainty about the Exalted One apart from the firsthand experience of a resurrection appearance.[1] In its own way, therefore, this Matthaean passage concerns itself with the question confronted in Jn.xx.29 when Jesus says to Thomas: "Have you believed because you have seen me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe."[2] Whereas the Fourth Evangelist reminds his readers of the nature of faith, which does not rely upon actual sight, the First Evangelist refers his readers to the message of the Exalted One and thereby obedience to him as that which overcomes doubt.

Mt.xxviii.16ff is indeed much more than a resurrection story. But the shift of emphasis in this scene from resurrection to exaltation is in no way anticipated in the earlier portions of the Matthaean resurrection narrative. Therein both references to the impending Galilean confrontation between the Resurrected One and his disciples stress only the appearance itself (vss.7, 10). This emphasis in these passages upon the manifestation is in accord with the Marcan account which also underscores only the promised appearance (Mk.xvi.7). In fact, although the First Evangelist appends Mt. xxviii.9ff to his revised edition of St. Mark, he makes no significant theological advance beyond his Marcan Vorlage until vss.16ff. The appearance of the Resurrected One to the frightened women (vss.9-10) merely reiterates what

---

1. Similarly, Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, p. 224.

2. This correlation between Mt.xxviii.17 and Jn.xx.29 is suggested by Otto Michel, "Abschluss der Matthäusevangeliums," pp. 17-18. Michel's proposal in this regard is presented and accepted by Gerhard Barth, "Law," pp. 132-133.

the Marcan resurrection episode declares: Jesus goes before his disciples to Galilee! The apologetic legend about the deceit of the chief priests (vss. 11-15) combats malicious gossip centering around what the Marcan resurrection story also attests: the tomb is empty! Only with the portrayal of the Exalted Jesus (vss.16ff) does the Matthaean resurrection narrative go beyond the Marcan story. Theologically considered, therefore, the framework within which the First Evangelist re-presents St. Mark is Matthew i-ii, on the one hand, and Matthew xxviii.16-20, on the other. The Gospel of St. Mark opens with the preaching of the messianic precursor and ends with the resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. The Gospel of St. Matthew begins with the infancy of Jesus the Messiah and concludes with his exaltation.

Jesus' last will and testament (chapter xxviii.18b-20). Above all else, that which transforms the final scene of St. Matthew into a portrayal of the Exalted Jesus is his closing declaration. Several scholars have rightly singled it out as the key passage of the entire Gospel.[1] The three-fold division of this concluding testimony has been noted. Both the syntax and the wording of these three sections indicate that the passage is a tightly knit ideational complex. The initial two parts are bound together by the therefore (= οὖν, vs.19).[2] The last two parts are connected by the and behold (= καὶ ἰδοὺ , vs.20b). The whole is welded together by a turn of expression that recurs throughout: all authority (= πᾶσα ἐξουσία , vs.18b); all nations (= πάντα τὰ ἔθνη , vs.19); all that I commanded (= πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην , vs.20a); and all the days (= πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας , vs.20b).[3]

---

1. Gottfried Schille, "Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. II. Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus," NTS, IV (1958), p. 113. Blair, Jesus in Matthew, p. 45. Michel, "Abschluss der Matthäusevangeliums," p. 21. Trilling, Das wahre Israel, p. 21. Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 173.

2. Such MSS. as ℵ, A, 28, and 69 omit this adverb.

3. This interesting observation is made by Günther Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 173.

In assessing the significance of these verses for the First Evangelist and his Gospel the question immediately arises of the extent to which he is responsible for their formulation. Insofar as an oral report of a Galilean resurrection appearance lies behind vss.16ff, the Evangelist is in some sense working with traditional material. Yet the question of his precise role in the formulation of Jesus' concluding address remains unanswered. This address does reflect a vocabulary which seems typical of the First Evangelist and/or his Gospel. A statistical comparison with the other Synoptic Gospels reveals the following results: ἐξουσία (Mt.10, Mk.10, Lk.15); οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ (Mt.10, Mk.0, Lk.5); πορεύεσθαι (Mt.28, Mk.1, Lk.49); μαθητεύειν (Mt.3, Mk.1, Lk.0); τηρεῖν (Mt.6, Mk.1, Lk.0); ἰδού (Mt.61, Mk.8, Lk.57); ἕως (Mt.27, Mk.9, Lk.12); and συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος (Mt.5, Mk.0, Lk.0).[1] Nevertheless, in spite of the presence in these verses of characteristically Matthaean words, it is unlikely that the First Evangelist has freely composed Jesus' closing testimony. Here too he is working with traditional material. This is certainly suggested by the correspondence between portions of Jesus' declaration and dominical sayings recorded elsewhere in the Gospel (as vs.18b= xi.27; and vs.20b=xviii.20). Furthermore, the baptismal formula may have been a liturgical statement used in the Evangelist's community (vs.19b).[2] Although there are parallels for certain portions of Jesus' address, there is

---

1. Knox, Synoptic Gospels, II, 124. Barth, "Law," p. 131, n. 1.

2. The three-fold name has been variously attributed to a post-Matthaean, Matthaean, or pre-Matthaean origin. Support for the former comes from the earlier works of Eusebius which seemingly attest this reading: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations in my name." But all Greek MSS. and versions include the formula. That the formula is pre-Matthaean rather than Matthaean in origin is suggested by the character of the Gospel. It is a "church-book."

no comparable parallel for the speech as a whole. Günther Bornkamm, therefore, probably comes close to the truth with his proposal that the First Evangelist is the one responsible for the uniting of these three originally separate dominical sayings into one interrelated declaration.[1] Whatever the precise solution to this literary problem, however, one can be certain that these words are fraught with meaning for the First Evangelist. In them he has perceived an appropriate conclusion to his Gospel.

Jesus' last will and testament opens with the declaration of his authority: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me" (vs.18b). It has long been recognized that this saying recalls Dan.vii.14 (LXX) wherein the enthronement of the Son of Man is described.[2] But whatever the literary relationship between this Matthaean verse and that OT passage, the theological significance of the former for the First Evangelist is pre-eminently determined by its setting in the Gospel.[3]

The emphasis upon the authority (= ἐξουσία) of the Exalted Jesus stands as a fitting climax to a Gospel which deliberately stresses the authority of the earthly Jesus (as Mt.vii.29=Mk.i.22; Mt.ix.6, 8=Mk.ii.10; Mt.xxi.23, 24, 27=Mk.xi.28, 29, 33). These Matthaean references to Jesus' authority are for the most part taken over from St. Mark; yet the way in which the First Evangelist incorporates them into his Gospel indicates that he is especially interested in the authority of the earthly Jesus. The Marcan

---

1. "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 173; also Barth, "Law," p. 133, n. 2. But compare Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, pp. 210-211.

2. So Barth, "Law," p. 133. Mt.xxviii.18b: Ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . Dan.vii.14 (LXX): καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα. καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῇ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῇ.

3. Similarly, Trilling, Das wahre Israel, pp. 21ff.

editorial comment which notes the people's response to Jesus' teaching in the Capernaum synagogue is used by the First Evangelist at the conclusion of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount: And when Jesus finished these sayings, the crowds were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes (Mt.vii.28-29). That Jesus did speak with unusual authority is evident by the succession of But I say to you sayings which lie at the core of the preceding sermon (Mt.v.21-48). Again, the Marcan story of the healing of the paralytic which contains a dominical Son of Man saying is sharply abbreviated by the First Evangelist, but without any alteration whatsoever to the saying: "But that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" (Mt.ix.6). The shortening of its narrative context serves to highlight this statement. That this statement interests the Evangelist is clear from his own concluding comment: When the crowds saw it /that is, the cure of the paralytic/ they were afraid, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to men (Mt.ix.8).[1] So Jesus the Messiah of word and deed acts with great authority. The stress upon the earthly authority of Jesus in these two passages prepares the way for his delegation of this authority to his disciples (Mt.x.1) and his dispute with the Pharisees over the source of his authority (Mt.xxi.23, 24, 27). The latter scene ends with Jesus' refusal to divulge the source of his authority. The forthright declaration of the authority of the Exalted Jesus, therefore, comes as an appropriate climax to the entire Gospel. In the Greek the sentence begins with the passive was given (= Ἐδόθη). This circumlocution points to God as the source of the

---

1. For a careful consideration of the First Evangelist's treatment of this Marcan miracle story, see Held, "Miracle Stories," pp. 175ff. According to Held, the particular theme worked out in the retelling of this story is that of Christology (rather than either faith or discipleship).

Exalted Jesus' authority.[1] That hidden from the Pharisees is now proclaimed to the disciples!

In terms of Jesus' authority there is a continuity between the earthly Jesus and the Exalted Jesus.[2] At the same time, however, there is a certain discontinuity. Before his exaltation Jesus has authority on earth (Mt.ix.6); but with his exaltation he receives all authority in heaven and on earth. As in the OT so in St. Matthew, the expression heaven and earth indicates the totality of the universe.[3] Jesus reigns over the whole universe. With regard to the authority of Jesus, the new element introduced at his exaltation is its universal extension.[4]

It is with all the authority in heaven and on earth that the Exalted Jesus issues his command: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" (vss.19-20a).

The fiat to make disciples (= μαθητεύσατε)is given by the Exalted Jesus to his disciples (= μαθηταὶ , vs.16); therefore, to win others to discipleship is to bring them into a relationship with the Exalted Jesus similar to that enjoyed among these disciples and the earthly Jesus. So again, now with regard to his relationship with his disciples, there is a kind of

---

1. Rengsdorf, "Judean Royal Ritual," p. 238.

2. So Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 174; also see the discussion by Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, pp. 222ff.

3. Trilling, Das wahre Israel, pp. 24-25. But, according to Trilling, the expression can indicate the totality of the universe either in terms of its diversity or in terms of its unity. Passages which suggest diversity include: Mt.v.35, vi.10, vi.19ff, xviii.18. Passages which suggest unity include: Mt.v.18, xi.25, xxiv.35.

4. Similarly, Bornkamm, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 175, and Strecker, Weg der Gerechtigkeit, pp. 211ff.

continuity between the earthly Jesus and the Exalted Jesus.[1]

The theme of discipleship permeates the entire Gospel.[2] But Wolfgang Trilling has correctly and cogently pointed to the brief episode involving Jesus and his mother and brothers as a concise statement of the First Evangelist's understanding of discipleship (Mt.xii.46-50=Mk.iii.31-35).[3] In St. Matthew as Jesus is speaking, an anonymous man informs him that his mother and his brothers desire to see him. Jesus replies: "Who is my mother and who are my brothers? . . . Here are my mother and my brothers! For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister and mother" (Mt.xii. 48ff). The First Evangelist's interpretation of this story is striking. The crucial difference between the Marcan story and his account lies in the persons of whom Jesus says, Here are, etc. In St. Mark the reference includes the whole crowd of people sitting about him. But in St. Matthew, the First Evangelist makes it plain that the disciples are meant (Mt.xii.49). With this addition to the story emerges the characteristic Matthaean equation: disciples= brothers of Jesus.[4] So to be a disciple or a brother of Jesus is to do the will of his heavenly Father; conversely, to do the will of Jesus' Father is to be his disciple or brother (see Mt.vi.10, vii.21, xxi.31).

---

1. See Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, p. 225.

2. For rather systematic treatments of the discipleship theme in St. Matthew, consult the following: Barth, "Law," pp. 105-25; and Davies, Sermon on the Mount, pp. 94ff.

3. Das wahre Israel, pp. 29ff.

4. Generally in St. Matthew when blood kinship is not meant brother means a disciple or fellow-Christian (as v.22, 23f, 47, vii.3-5; xviii.15, 21). So Davies, Sermon on the Mount, p. 98. In fact, within the resurrection account itself appears the equation brother=disciple (xxviii.10).

But discipleship after the exaltation of Jesus acquires a new dimension. The Exalted Jesus commissions his disciples to make disciples of all nations. As elsewhere in St. Matthew, the phrase all nations (= πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) means the whole inhabited world, both Jew and Gentile.[1] With the exaltation of Jesus, therefore, there is not only a universalizing of his authority but also a universalizing of those who recognize and live under that authority.

This commission of the Exalted Jesus stands in rather sharp contrast to certain dominical sayings recorded earlier in the Gospel. To the Canaanite woman Jesus declared: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt.xv.24). In a similar vein he had ordered the twelve: "Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt.x.5f). As is well known, these sayings are peculiar to St. Matthew. Whatever else may be said, by incorporating them into his Gospel (with the latter placed at the outset of his missionary discourse), the First Evangelist must have envisaged a mission program which had proceeded generally in two stages: firstly, the earthly Jesus and his disciples concentrated their labor upon Israel; and secondly, empowered by the Exalted Jesus, the disciples extended their efforts to the world at

---

1. Trilling has convincingly shown that this is the meaning of all nations in Mt.xxv.32, xxiv.9, and probably xxiv.14; but compare Kenneth W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," JBL, LXVI (1947), 165-72. If all nations in Mt.xxviii.19 does mean both Jew and Gentile, how is this reconciled with the Matthaean emphasis upon the rejection of the Jews (as in Mt.viii.12; xxi.43; xxvii.25)? According to Trilling, the First Evangelist holds a view of the Church as the True Israel whose membership is comprised of all nations without the distinction between Jew and Gentile playing any significant role. In effect, the so called rejection of the Jews is a rejection of the False Israel. See his Das wahre Israel, pp. 26-27, 50-51. A similar position is adopted by W. G. Kümmel (Feine-Behm), Introduction to NT, p. 82, and James L. Price, Interpreting NT, p. 202.

large.[1] Yet along with the aforementioned sayings, the First Evangelist has adopted other logia which suggest that the earthly Jesus himself anticipated the eventual world-wide extension of discipleship (as Mt.xiii.38, xxii.9, xxiv.9, 14, xxv.32). Furthermore, the earthly Jesus himself mediates salvation to non-Jews (as Mt.viii.5ff; xv.22ff; also ii.1ff). Insofar as the universal mission is anticipated throughout the Gospel it does reflect what might be called a "gentile bias."[2] So the concluding command of the Exalted Jesus does sound a note heard earlier in the Gospel.

If the sharing of discipleship among all peoples is the goal of the disciples' task, the first means by which this end is accomplished is by baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.[3] This order by the Exalted Jesus comes as something of a surprise. In no way had the earthly Jesus suggested that the way of discipleship involved or would involve such a baptism. It was neither required of those whom he called to follow him nor were they commissioned to baptize (Mt.iv.18-22=Mk.i.16-20; Mt.x.1ff=Mk.iii.13ff, vi.7ff).[4] Therefore, the First Evangelist's precise understanding of this baptism in the triadic name is by no means self-evident. Yet John practiced water baptism and the earthly Jesus did submit himself to that baptism (Mt.iii.1-17=Mk.i.2-11). It is quite possible that the First

---

1. For a similar assessment of the First Evangelist's view of Jesus' mission to the world, see Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, pp. 38-39; also pp. 19ff. It must be said, however, that Jeremias is only incidentally concerned with the attitude of the First Evangelist in this regard. His primary task is the uncovering of the attitude of the historical Jesus toward the Gentile mission. But compare Trilling, Das wahre Israel, pp. 101-03.

2. Clark, "Gentile Bias," pp. 165ff.

3. A brief consideration of the textual problem relating to this verse is presented on p. 153, n. 2.

4. But compare Jn.iii.22, iv.2.

Evangelist's handling of the Marcan material in this regard indirectly betrays something of his own view of that baptism enjoined upon the disciples by the Exalted Jesus, and presumably practiced in his community.

In succession, St. Mark includes the so called Isaianic prophecy (i.2-3), the brief narrative concerning John's ministry (i.4-6), a short expression of his message (i.7-8), and finally his baptism of Jesus (i.9-11). Following the OT passage, John is introduced with this statement: "John the baptizer appeared in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (= εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν , vs.4). Shortly thereafter it is noted that many were baptized by him "confessing their sins" (= ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν , vs.5). So John's baptism involves the forgiveness of sins; and the ἁμαρτίας in vs.5 recalls the ἁμαρτιῶν of vs.4 so as to suggest that the confession itself is climaxed by forgiveness.

The First Evangelist interprets this Marcan complex by rearrangement, omission, and the addition of non-Marcan or "Q" material. St. Matthew includes a brief summary of John's message (iii.1-2), the OT citation (iii.3=Mk.i.3), the narrative comment on the activity of John (iii.4-6=Mk.i.4-6), John's message about the unproductivity of the Pharisees (iii.7-10=Lk.iii.7-9) and about Jesus (iii.11=Mk.i.7-8=Lk.iii.16; iii.12=Lk.iii.17), and at last the account of Jesus' baptism by John (iii.13-17=Mk.i.9-11). In his redactional work, the First Evangelist interprets the Marcan presentation of John's baptism so that the emphasis falls upon repentance to the exclusion of forgiveness. Unlike St. Mark, St. Matthew does not open with the Isaianic oracle which is applied to John as the messianic forerunner. Instead, the First Evangelist has John proclaiming: "Repent (= Μετανοεῖτε)the Kingdom of

Heaven is at hand" (vs.2; compare iv.17, x.7).[1] In its Matthaean setting, therefore, the originally Marcan mention of the people confessing their sins (vs.6) becomes an act of repentance divorced from any notice of forgiveness. The "Q" passage aimed at the Pharisees carries this repentance theme forward with its reference to repentance (= μετανοίας , vs.8). Finally, in St. Matthew John distinguishes between his and Jesus' baptisms in the following manner: "I baptize you with water for repentance (= εἰς μετάνοιαν) . . . he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (vs.11).[2] So in St. Matthew the Marcan words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν are omitted. Furthermore, John's baptism is a baptism εἰς μετάνοιαν. To the First Evangelist, therefore, John's baptism of repentance has no power for the remission of sins.[3]

This limitation of the efficacy of John's baptism to repentance cannot be explained simply as a reflection of the early Church's desire to elevate Jesus above John; for in the Matthaean context the First Evangelist does not correspondingly attribute to Jesus a baptism which forgives sins.

---

1. At the outset of St. Matthew, both the message of John and the message of Jesus are brought into the closest possible connection with one another. Their messages are summarized in precisely the same words: "Repent, the Kingdom of God is at hand"(iii.2, iv.17). Furthermore, in nearly the same words, Jesus instructs the disciples to proclaim: "The Kingdom of God is at hand" (x.7). In spite of the similarity among the messages of John, Jesus, and the disciples, however, John and Jesus have very different roles in salvation history. See Bornkamm, "End-Expectation," pp. 15-16.

2. The attempt to determine precisely the First Evangelist's contribution to this logion as it now appears in his Gospel is complicated by the fact that it is preserved in "Q" as well as St. Mark. Consult Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 245-47. But the Matthaean inclusion of εἰς μετάνοιαν over against both St. Mark and St. Luke probably reflects an addition by the First Evangelist. Mk.i.8: "'I have baptized you with water; but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.'" Lk.iii.16: "'I baptize you with water . . . he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire.'"

3. Günther Bornkamm assesses the First Evangelist's view of John's baptism in a similar way, "End-Expectation," p. 15; but compare Barth, "Law," p. 117.

Rather he repeats the Marcan and/or "Q" logion which views the issue with regard to baptism more in terms of kind than simply in terms of function. John's water baptism (for repentance) is contrasted with Jesus' baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire.[1] Because the restriction of the value of John's baptism to repentance cannot be explained solely on the basis of the concerns of the immediate Matthaean setting, the motive for this qualification must be sought elsewhere. Perhaps the First Evangelist is guided in part by his own understanding of Christian baptism.[2] To him John's water baptism of repentance stands not only in contrast to Jesus' baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire but also in contrast to the later Christian water baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. If this be the case, then the question raised by Hugh Anderson relative to Mt.xxviii.19 receives an affirmative answer: "Does not the baptism in the triadic name, which is enjoined upon the Church in its mission . . . also recall Jesus' death as the agent of God's forgiveness of sins?"[3] The affirmative reply is forthcoming because the First Evangelist clearly sees an inexorable bond between Jesus' sacrificial death and the

---

1. A similar contrast appears in Acts i.5 and xi.16. Viewed against the OT background the baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire suggests the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit (as Isa.xliv.3; Joel 3.1ff) and the judgment of the Lord (as Isa.lxvi.15ff). But it is problematical as to precisely how the First Evangelist understood this reference to the Holy Spirit. Bonnard interprets it as synonymous with fire and suggestive of purification (as Zech.xiii.9), Matthieu, p. 38; similarly, Beare, Earliest Records of Jesus, p. 40. Supposedly the Evangelist would see here a foretelling of the purification with the Holy Spirit experienced in conversion. Yet elsewhere in St. Matthew the Holy Spirit plays no role in the Evangelist's understanding of conversion. See Barth, "Law," pp. 116ff. Perhaps the Evangelist would see here a reference to the intermittent help of God which Jesus himself promises to his disciples and describes in terms of the Holy Spirit (so Mt.x.20=Mk.xiii. 11).

2. Trilling discusses several passages which may have achieved their present form under the influence, however slight, of the First Evangelist's awareness of the actuality and efficacy of Christian baptism. For instance, Mt.xx.22ff (compare Mk.x.38ff). Das wahre Israel, pp. 32ff.

3. Jesus and Christian Origins, p. 225.

forgiveness of sins. At the Last Supper as Jesus passed the cup he said: "Drink of it, all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (= εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mt.xxvi.28; compare Mk.xiv.24). The concluding reference to the forgiveness of sins has been added by the First Evangelist to the Marcan verse; and, interestingly enough, it duplicates exactly the phrase omitted by the First Evangelist from St. Mark with regard to the baptism of John (= εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mk.i.4).

The disciples baptize all peoples in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.[1] Thereby these peoples are placed into the possession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.[2] This triadic formulation is by no means inappropriate in the First Gospel. St. Matthew speaks of God as Father much more than either of the other Synoptics.[3] He is Father both of Jesus (as Mt.xvi.17, etc.) and of the disciples (as Mt.vi.14, x.20, etc.). Passages occur in which the terms Father and Son are juxtaposed, on the one hand (Mt.xi.25ff; xxiv.36 [?]), and the terms Son and Holy Spirit, on the other (Mt.iii.13ff).[4]

The second means by which the sharing of discipleship with all nations is accomplished is by teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you.

---

1. Compare Didache vii.1. Elsewhere in the NT, baptism is often "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (as Acts viii.16, xix.5).

2. M'Neile, Matthew, p. 436.

3. Edward P. Blair reports these figures for the usage of the term "Father" with reference to God: Mt.45; Mk.4; Lk.15; but Jn. 107, Jesus in Matthew, pp. 58-59. For further discussion of this evidence, consult H. F. D. Sparks, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, edited by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 251ff.

4. In the Matthaean account of the baptism of Jesus, the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God.

The command by the Exalted Jesus to baptize in the triadic name had not been anticipated by the earthly Jesus. But with this second injunction the Exalted Jesus explicitly refers his disciples back to his earthly ministry among them. He calls their attention to all that I have commanded you.

Among the many emphases in the First Gospel that distinguish it from St. Mark none is more conspicuous than its concern for the commandments or teachings of Jesus.[1] This interest in the teachings of Jesus is reflected in the very structure of the Gospel itself. The narrative movement is arrested throughout by large collections of dominical sayings (as Mt.v-vii, etc.).[2] Furthermore, although not without other qualities, Jesus in the Gospel of St. Matthew bears a marked resemblance to a rabbinic teacher. This portrait of Jesus is epitomized by a saying peculiar to the First Gospel. Jesus says to his disciples: "But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher and you are all brothers"(Mt.xxiii.8). As a teacher Jesus is the leader of a brotherhood of followers. Consequently, W. D.Davies is essentially correct when he observes: "The title disciples (μαθηταί) applied to Christians in Matthew is not merely a derivative from the tradition, but indicative of a significant aspect of the nature of the Christian life." Indeed, "the relation of Christians to Jesus during his earthly ministry, and after his exaltation in the Resurrection, can be expressed in a terminology from Judaism,

---

1. In St. Mark the words διδάσκειν and διδαχή are used some twenty times, and exclusively in relation to Jesus' ministry. According to Eduard Schweizer, therefore, the Second Evangelist is very much interested in the teaching of Jesus, but in the fact of that teaching rather than its content, "Mark's Contribution to the Quest of the Historical Jesus," NTS, X (1964), pp. 421ff. By contrast, the First Evangelist is also concerned with the content of Jesus' teaching. In other words, he is interested in the teachings of Jesus.

2. This leaves open the unsettled question of the number of discourses presented in St. Matthew. Relative to the problem of the structure of St. Matthew, consult Kümmel, Introduction to NT, p. 75.

the religion of the Law."[1] So during his life, as well as after, the disciples of Jesus sit at his feet as pupils before their teacher. But more than resembling a rabbinic teacher, the Matthaean Jesus recalls the prototype of all rabbinic teachers: Moses himself! Following his exodus from Egypt (Mt.ii.13ff), and his temptation in the wilderness (Mt.iv.1ff), Jesus stands upon the mountain and establishes the abiding validity of the Law (Mt.v.17ff).[2] He concludes his so called Sermon on the Mount with this declaration: "Every one who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man who built his house upon a rock. . . . And every one who hears these words of mine and does not do them will be like a foolish man who built his house upon the sand" (Mt.vii.24ff).

Earlier it was suggested that to be a disciple is to do the will of Jesus' heavenly Father. It now becomes clear that to be a disciple is to do the will of Jesus' heavenly Father as Jesus himself makes that will known through his teachings and his interpretation of the Law.[3]

---

1. Sermon on the Mount, pp. 94ff. A statistical analysis of μαθηταί produces the following results: Mt.73, Mk.46, Lk.38, Jn.78, and Acts 28.

2. These much discussed words give expression to the Rabbinic notion of the immutability of the Torah (particularly vs.18a). Given to Moses by Yahweh, the Torah in both its oral and written forms was not subject to change. See Davies, Sermon on the Mount, pp. 157-58; also Barth, "Law," pp. 62-73.

3. The involved question of whether or not, and in what sense, the Matthaean Jesus is a giver of a nova lex need not be delved into in great detail. Gerhard Barth is certainly correct in denying that the Matthaean Jesus promulgates a nova lex either in the sense of his teaching being set over against the Mosaic law or in the sense of his teaching being understood legally. On the one hand, Jesus establishes the abiding validity of the (Mosaic) law (as Mt.v.17ff) and frequently summarizes the law and the prophets (as Mt.vii.12, xx.40). On the other hand, Jesus' teaching on the law (as Mt. v-vii) occurs within the context of grace (as Mt.iv.23ff and viii.1ff). See Barth, "Law," pp. 153-59. Yet Jesus does offer a new (or true) interpretation of the Mosaic law (as Mt.v.21-46). In this sense, W. D. Davies is correct in viewing the Sermon on the Mount as Torah, but as Messianic Torah. With reference to Jesus, in other words, "he is not Moses come as Messiah, if we may so put it, so much as Messiah, Son of Man, Emmanuel, who has absorbed the Mosaic function," Sermon on the Mount, p. 93. But the Matthaean Jesus does

It is precisely to his earthly teachings and his earthly interpretation of the Law that the Exalted Jesus refers his disciples. They are to teach the people to observe all that I have commanded you (τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν). As parallels elsewhere in St. Matthew[1] as well as in the OT[2] show, the entire phrase reflects rather common legal terminology. But there is nothing in this to suggest that the all denotes simply "all his moral commands."[3] Rather the all embraces the full range of the teachings imparted to the disciples by the earthly Jesus--moral (as Mt.v.17ff), ceremonial (as Mt.vi.1ff), disciplinary (as Mt.xviii.15ff), and perhaps even eschatological (as Mt.xxiv.44)![4]

With its commission of the disciples to share their discipleship with the whole world, this middle section of Jesus' last will and testament bears all the marks of a missionary charge (vss.19-20a).[5] Yet the means by which this discipleship is extended disclose that such a description does not in any way exhaust the import of these words. The disciples are to baptize in the triune name. They are to teach the observance of all Jesus' commands. It is not by chance that priority is given to baptism; for the totality of Jesus' teachings was not intended for pre-baptismal instruction. Rather his teachings

---

absorb the Mosaic function; and he commends his words for obedience (Mt.vii. 24ff). For other discussions of this aspect of St. Matthew consult the following: Bacon, Studies in Matthew, pp. 339-60; Kilpatrick, Origins, pp. 107-09; Price, Interpreting NT, pp. 203-04; and Blair, Jesus in Matthew, pp. 110-37.

1. For the legal usage of τηρεῖν consult Mt.xix.17, xxiii.3.

2. For example, Ex.vii.2; xxix.35; Deut.i.41; iv.2. See Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 419.

3. M'Neile, Matthew, p. 437.

4. Correctly, Stendahl, "Matthew," p. 798.

5. Compare Mk.xvi.15ff; Lk.xxiv.44-49; Jn.xx19-23; and Act.i.4-8. Günther Bornkamm correctly points out that the uniqueness of these Matthaean verses is that they connect mission with exaltation, "Mt 28, 16-20," p. 175.

involved all that was required for the ordering of his brotherhood. The disciples, therefore, do not face the future as just so many individuals. They face the future together; and so this missionary charge is also a community rule.[1]

Having charged his disciples, the Exalted Jesus turns from command to promise: "And behold, I am with you always, to the close of the age" (vs.20b). The disciples are sent forth into the world with the assurance that the Exalted Jesus himself is ever with them. The earthly Jesus had anticipated this promise when he told the disciples: "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt.xviii.20). This notion of the presence of the Exalted Jesus among his disciples is characteristically Matthaean. In Luke-Acts following the heavenly exalation of the Resurrected Jesus, the Holy Spirit is poured out upon the disciples (as Lk.xxiv.44-53; Actsii.1ff). In St. John Jesus promises the gift of the Paraclete or the Holy Spirit who will come in his name (as Jn.xiv.16-17, 26-27, xv.26-27, xvi.7-16).

The expression I am with you has its roots in the OT, particularly in the historical writings.[2] Therein it is often said that Yahweh is with a person or, less frequently, with the whole people Israel. Recognizing this, Otto Michel sees in the Matthaean statement a declaration of the divine protection.[3] Although agreeing in part with Michel, W. C. van Unnik claims that in its OT usage the expression reflects a number of different but related

---

1. Trilling, Das wahre Israel, p. 40.

2. For example, Gen.xxviii.15, xxxix.23; Deut.xx.1; Josh.iii.7. For an extensive survey of the OT evidence in this regard, consult W. C. van Unnik, "Dominus Vobiscum," pp. 276-86.

3. "Abschluss der Matthäusevangeliums," pp.16ff.

connotations.[1] Emphasizing that the expression defines active power rather than static presence, van Unnik states: ". . . Jesus who has now all authority comforts his weak followers (cf.26.56) and assures them of His powerful assistance (note: εἰμι, not ἔσομαι) which will make their activity both powerful and successful."[2] In its Matthaean setting, however, the expression I am with you certainly does suggest something of an abiding presence. The Exalted Jesus is with his disciples always (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας). Furthermore, contrary to its predominant usage in the OT, the phrase has a definite communal reference. The Exalted Jesus remains present in his congregation. That the Evangelist understands the words I am with you in terms of a communal presence is also intimated by his use of the logion appearing on the lips of the earthly Jesus: "For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt. xviii.20).[3] The First Evangelist places this saying in the middle of his fourth discourse (Mt.xviii.1-xix.2) wherein he is concerned with "relations in the church"[4] or "Church problems."[5] Just as the communal presence of Jesus in the closing pericope presupposes baptism in his name, so here his communal presence presupposes convocation in his name.

---

1. Among these are the following: protection, help, deliverance; taking sides with; blessing and success in worldly affairs; assurance that there is no reason to fear; exhortation to valor, "Dominus Vobiscum," p. 276.

2. Ibid., p. 287.

3. As is often noted, these words recall a saying attributed to Rabbi Hananiah ben Teradion (died ca.135): "Two that sit together and are occupied in the words of the Torah have the Shekinah among them" (שְׁנַיִם שֶׁיּוֹשְׁבִין וְעוֹסְקִין בְּדִבְרֵי תוֹרָה שְׁכִינָה בֵּינֵיהֶן, Aboth iii.2). But in the dominical saying, the place of the Torah is taken by the name of Jesus; and the place of the Shekinah is taken by Jesus himself. Consequently, the sayings are as dissimilar as they are similar.

4. Kümmel (Feine-Behm), Introduction to NT, p. 74.

5. Price, Interpreting NT, p. 196.

He is in the midst of those who belong to him. In its Matthaean context, the saying explains why the heavenly Father will grant the prayer of any two disciples who agree about anything. As W. C. van Unnik states: "Where the smallest number of Christians are gathered in Jesus' name, they may be sure of His active assistance which is a spiritual power, bringing unity of spirit ('agree', v.19) and contact with the Father."[1] The usage of this saying by the First Evangelist makes it clear that he does not subscribe to the view that the presence of the Exalted Jesus in the congregation is actualized solely through the preaching of the law.[2]

The Exalted Jesus vouchsafes his presence to the close of the age (= ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος). The earthly Jesus had often spoken with his disciples about the close of the age (as Mt.xiii.39, 40, 49; xxiv.3). Significantly, it is just this phrase that the First Evangelist inserts into essentially Marcan material at the very outset of the apocalyptic discourse (Mt.xxiv.1-xxvi.2). The disciples inquire of Jesus: "Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign of your coming and of the close of the age" (= συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, Mt.xxiv.3; compare Mk.xiii.4). Another addition to St. Mark is the mention of the parousia. So the First Evangelist binds the question of the end of the age to the question of the parousia. As the result of this redactional work, the entire discourse which reaches its climax with the Son of Man enthroned for the last judgment becomes a reply to these related questions.

The mention of the close of the age at the very end of the Gospel serves as a reminder that the disciples, or the Church, under the Lordship of

---

1. "Dominus Vobiscum," p. 288.

2. Barth, "Law," p. 136; compare Anderson, Origins, pp. 225-26.

the Exalted Jesus constitute the eschatological people of God. Yet as the final phrase in the last will and testament of the Exalted Jesus, the close of the age is of no intrinsic concern to the Evangelist. Indeed, the parousia is not mentioned. Rather the words stand in virtual apposition to the always. They simply underscore the perpetuity of the Exalted Jesus' presence with his disciples; and, above all else, it is just this presence that the Exalted Jesus bequeaths his disciples. Relative to vs.20b, therefore, Wolfgang Trilling is quite right when he declares that "the eyes of the Evangelist are chiefly turned towards the present, the current situation."[1]

Jesus' last will and testament (vss.18-20) is truly the key passage of the whole Gospel. In fact, it is the whole Gospel in miniature. Firstly, many of the main emphases of the Gospel are caught up in these closing words. Among the many emphases exposed by the preceding analysis are the authority of Jesus, discipleship, the universal scope of salvation, obedience to the teachings of Jesus, and the abiding presence of the Exalted One among his disciples. Secondly, the basic character of the Gospel is reflected in its closing words. As a "church book" the Gospel grows out of and is intended to serve the varied needs of a particular congregation. Similarly, its conclusion summarizes that congregation's understanding of itself as a people living under the rule of the Exalted One.

Jesus' origins as the basis of his authority (chapters i-ii, xxviii. 16-20). Opposite the infancy account of Matthew i-ii, the final scene of Matthew xxviii.16-20 forms the outer molding of the framework within which the First Evangelist re-presents his Marcan Vorlage. One of the prominent themes in this closing scene offers further insight into the First Evangelist's

---

1. Das wahre Israel, p. 45.

concern for the origins of Jesus as they are explicated in Matthew i-ii.

With the opening line of Jesus' concluding address, the First Evangelist elevates the theme of Jesus' authority to a programmatic position in the Gospel: "All authority (= ἐξουσία) in heaven and on earth has been given to me" (Mt.xxviii.18b). Recognizing this, Edward Blair seizes upon the word ἐξουσία as providing an appropriate motif around which to order the varied christological emphases of the First Gospel.[1] So in his reappraisal of Matthaean Christology, he portrays in successive chapters "the basis of Jesus' authority," "the authority of Jesus in the realm of knowledge," and "the authority of Jesus in the realm of conduct." Particularly suggestive for an understanding of the Evangelist's interest in Jesus' origins in Matthew i-ii, however, is Blair's etymological analysis of the word ἐξουσία. In this regard, he writes:

> The term "authority" (ἐξουσία) has a long history and a varied usage in classical and Hellenistic Greek. It is derived from a word meaning "it is allowed," "it is possible" (ἔξεστιν) and has as its primary meaning "power of choice," "liberty of action." In contracts, wills, and other legal documents of the New Testament period it denotes the "claim," or "right," or "control" one has over anything. It comes to mean also "ability to do something, capability, might, power" and is thus descriptive of the power exercised by rulers and officials of various sorts.[2]

Following a brief survey of the usage of ἐξουσία in a few selected biblical passages, Blair concludes:

> "Authority" as both inherent right and manifest capability usually is associated with particular identity: one has it because of what or who he is or what he is made to be by another.[3]

Authority, therefore, may be defined either in terms of inherent right or manifest capability.

---

1. Jesus in Matthew.
2. Ibid., pp. 46-47.
3. Ibid., p. 47.

In the thought of the First Evangelist, as observed earlier,[1] the authority of the Exalted Jesus is the logical extension of the authority of the earthly Jesus. Certainly the authority of both the Exalted and the earthly Jesus is predicated upon his inherent right to that authority, upon who he is. Yet in the passages which specifically mention Jesus' authority, that authority is viewed pre-eminently in terms of his manifest capability. The authority of the Exalted Jesus manifests itself in his sending forth of the disciples and his assurance that with his powerful assistance they will be successful (Mt.xxviii.18b). The authority of the earthly Jesus manifests itself in his challenging word and healing deed (Mt.vii.29; ix.6, 8; xxi.23, 24, 27).

By concluding his Gospel with the last will and testament of the Exalted Jesus, the First Evangelist has underscored the authority of Jesus as manifest capability. By beginning his Gospel with the infancy traditions, the First Evangelist has firmly anchored Jesus' authority in his origins. He thereby demonstrates that this Jesus born in Bethlehem and reared in Nazareth is none other than the Davidic Emmanuel and thus has the inherent right to the authority openly manifested in his earthly ministry--and beyond! Jesus' origins, therefore, constitute the basis of his authority.

With this desire to root Jesus' authority in his origins, the First Evangelist obviously goes beyond his Marcan Vorlage. Furthermore, as will be seen, he differs from Luke in this regard insofar as the latter does not use the infancy traditions primarily to establish Jesus' origins. The closest parallel to this Matthaean interest in the origins of Jesus as the basis of his authority is to be found in the Gospel of St. John. Of course, the

---

1. See above, pp. 154ff.

Fourth Evangelist's understanding of Jesus' origin is quite different from that reflected in St. Matthew. To the Fourth Evangelist, Jesus is not the Davidic Emmanuel from Bethlehem and Nazareth but rather the One from above, the Logos become flesh (Jn.i.1-18).[1] Following the prologue, throughout the Gospel, the Fourth Evangelist reminds his readers in his own inimitable ironic style that Jesus' origin is from above and thus is the basis for his authority (as Jn.vii.25-29, 40-52; ix.29ff; xix.9).

The thesis has been set forth that with the infancy account of Matthew i-ii the First Evangelist presents a dogmatic and scriptural answer to the questions From whom and From where. Yet it is only from the perspective of Mt.xxviii.18b with its climactic stress upon the authority of the Exalted Jesus that the full significance of the Evangelist's preoccupation with these questions comes to the fore. Certainly the questions From whom and From where have been forced upon the First Evangelist by the diverse tradition of Jesus' origins; but as the closing pericope of the Gospel makes quite clear, there is a certain urgency about his dealing with these questions insofar as they involve the deeper question of Jesus' authority. The recognition of the connection in the thought of the First Evangelist between Jesus' origins and his authority reinforces the contention that in Matthew i-ii the Evangelist's concern is primarily dogmatic and only secondarily apologetic.

The transcendence of Davidic messianism. Although Matthew xxviii.16-20

---

1. Although this does not mean that geography plays no role in the theological reflection of the Fourth Evangelist, it does mean that his interest in geography is not strictly speaking a concern for Jesus' origin. This is borne out by the investigations of Wayne A. Meeks: "Our analysis has shown that the geographical symbolism of John is not dominated by Jerusalem to the exclusion of Galilee, but is shaped by the apparently deliberate dialectic between Jerusalem, the place of judgment and rejection, and Galilee and Samaria, the place of acceptance and discipleship," "Galilee and Judea in the Fourth Gospel," JBL, LXXXV (1966), 169.

with its emphasis upon Jesus' authority casts further light upon the First Evangelist's interest in Jesus' origins as explicated in Matthew i-ii, these opposing ends of the Gospel seem far removed one from the other. Their basic intentions are quite different.

With the traditions of Jesus' birth and infancy, the First Evangelist establishes his messianic origins. Geographically, the place names of primary significance are Bethlehem and Nazareth. Genealogically, the honorific titles of utmost importance are the Son of David and Emmanuel. The way in which the Evangelist goes about his task represents the triumph of Davidic messianism; for he demonstrates that the varied details of Jesus' origin--Davidic descent, virginal conception, Bethlehem birth, and Nazareth settlement--were foretold of old concerning the Davidic Messiah.

In the closing pericope, however, the First Evangelist is certainly not interested in Jesus' origins. Neither the place names nor the chief messianic titles significant in that regard are carried over. In fact, no honorific name is bestowed upon Jesus in this final scene. Rather with the tradition of a resurrection appearance and several dominical sayings, the Evangelist portrays the Exalted Jesus; and the situation of the disciples on that Galilean mountain tends to shade over into the situation of the Evangelist and his congregation who live under the aegis of the Exalted One. As noted, in these closing verses, the eyes of the Evangelist are riveted on the present--his present! This concern for the exaltation of Jesus represents a transcendence of Davidic categories insofar as the Davidic Messiah was to be an earthly figure; and the First Evangelist makes no attempt to import Davidic concepts into the concluding scene. The possible literary connection between Mt.xxviii.18b and Dan.vii.14 bears witness to this transcendence; for the latter text stands within the stream of Son of Man rather than Son of David

speculation. But neither is the Exalted Jesus of Mt.xxviii.16ff the Son of Man who will come in judgment at the end of the age. He is the Present One who reigns among his disciples until the close of the age.

In spite of these fundamental differences between Matthew xxviii.16-20 and Matthew i-ii, there are two features of the last pericope which recall Jesus' origins.

Firstly, the epiphany of the Exalted Jesus takes place in Galilee (Mt.xxviii.16). It was to Galilee that the infant Jesus withdrew under the paternal protection of Joseph (Mt.ii.22). As is generally acknowledged, the First Evangelist has a certain predilection for Galilee in contradistinction to Judea.[1] It is this general predisposition that has produced this geographical continuity between the infancy account and the closing pericope; but there is nothing in either context to suggest that the Evangelist takes this continuity to be of any theological importance.

Secondly, and more significantly, the Exalted Jesus offers his disciples this assurance: "I am with you always" (= ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας , Mt.xxviii.20b). In the midst of the story of Jesus' birth, the First Evangelist had quoted and commented upon Isa.vii.14 in this way: ". . . they shall call his name Emmanuel"--which means "God with us" (= Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός , Mt.i.23). In other words, the ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι recalls

---

1. For instance, Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, pp. 195ff. It is St. Matthew's predilection for Galilee, particularly in the resurrection narrative (as St. Mark; but compare Lk.xxiv, Jn.xx), that provided Ernst Lohmeyer supporting evidence for his thesis that Galilee along with Jerusalem comprised one of the two main centers of primitive Christianity in Palestine. For his evaluation of St. Matthew in this regard, consult Galiläa und Jerusalem ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," n.s. 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), pp. 15-17, 36-39.

the μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.[1] But in itself this literary similarity does not justify the conclusion that the First Evangelist sees some theological connection between the two passages. That which does justify this conclusion is the fact that within the birth story itself the Evangelist uses the name Emmanuel (that is, "God with us") not only to point to Jesus' messianic origin of the Holy Spirit but also to substantiate his messianic function; for he will save his people from their sins (Mt.i.21). These two passages, therefore, interpret one another. Variously, the Emmanuel, or "God with us" (Mt.i.23) and the I (Mt. xxviii.20b) denote the Exalted Jesus; and the they (Mt.i.23), the his people (Mt.i.21), and the you (Mt.xxviii.20b) designate the eschatological community with whom the Exalted Jesus is ever present.[2] In the final section of the Gospel, therefore, the other name of some significance with regard to Jesus' genealogical origins, the Son of David, has been completely ignored and the title Emmanuel recalled. Why? The answer is rather simple. From the perspective of the post-resurrection Church whose situation is reflected in these last verses, only the name Emmanuel is an appropriate title for the Exalted Jesus. As will be seen, it is from just this perspective that the Evangelist consciously calls into question the adequacy of the title Son of David. The implication is that this name is "earth bound." It is appropriate only with reference to the earthly Jesus. Finally, within

---

1. Among those who see in the closing pericope an echo of the Emmanuel prophecy are the following: Price, Interpreting NT, pp. 201-02; Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, p. 226; Barth, "Law," p. 135; and Trilling, Das wahre Israel, p. 41.

2. Furthermore, the mention of salvation from sins (Mt.i.21) is reminiscent of the forgiveness from sins (Mt.xxvi.28) which may be implied by the baptism in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Mt. xxviii.19). So there are multiple thematic connections between the story of Jesus' birth and the final pericope of the Gospel.

the narrower context of Matthew i-ii whose primary aim was the establishment of Jesus' messianic origins, the name Emmanuel was forced into a Davidic straitjacket. But insofar as it is recalled in the closing pericope, it is freed from specifically Davidic associations and makes its own contribution toward the transcendence of Davidic messianism.

The Earthly Ministry of Jesus

Having considered the relationship between the infancy and the exaltation accounts within which the First Evangelist has enclosed his revision of St. Mark, it is now appropriate to inquire how the Evangelist's interest in Jesus' origins unfolds in that revision itself (Mt.iii-xxviii.15).

The geographical origins of Jesus and his earthly ministry (chapters ii, iii-xxviii.15). By moving Jesus to Nazareth of Galilee at the conclusion of the infancy story, the First Evangelist can neatly join that account to the broader geographical outline of Jesus' ministry which is adopted virtually intact from St. Mark. Specifically, the Evangelist makes the transition to the Marcan material with the rather vague temporal expression: In those days (= Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις , Mt.iii.1).[1] This connecting phrase serves to indicate that John the Baptizer appeared in the wilderness while Jesus was still living in Nazareth of Galilee.[2] So the geographical note on which the infancy story ended is carried over into the account of John's

---

1. This kind of general temporal expression has its counterpart in the OT (as Gen.xxxviii.1, Ex.ii.1, Dan.x.2, etc.). So Bonnard, Matthieu, p. 31.

2. Filson correctly understands the significance of this transitional phrase, Matthew, p. 63.

activities and thus prepares the way for the reference to Jesus' departure from Galilee to the Jordan (= ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, Mt.iii.13; see Mk.i.9). According to the ensuing outline of Jesus' ministry, his early work is concentrated in Galilee (Mt.iii-xviii=Mk.i-ix). Next comes a brief ministry in Judea as he winds his way to Jerusalem (Mt.xix-xx=Mk.x). It is in Jerusalem that Jesus is put to death and resurrected (Mt.xxi-xxviii. 15=Mk.xi-xvi.8). So the Evangelist's explication of Jesus' geographical origins merges with the broad geographical framework of Jesus' adult ministry. Any later references or allusions to those origins occur within this general setting.

In explicating Jesus' geographical origins in chapter two of the infancy account, the Evangelist shows how Jesus the Messiah born in Bethlehem of Judea came from Nazareth of Galilee. But having settled Jesus in Nazareth of Galilee (Mt.ii.22-23), he never again mentions Bethlehem. Thereafter, it is assumed that Nazareth is Jesus' native village. In fact, Nazareth is explicitly called his home town (= πατρίς, Mt.xiii.54, 57=Mk.vi.1, 4).[1] Galilee is his native territory.[2] In an acclamation peculiar to the First Gospel, the teeming masses in Jerusalem shout: "This is the prophet Jesus from

---

1. Neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark include the name Nazareth in the episode involving Jesus' rejection at his πατρίς. But the broader context makes it clear that Nazareth is meant. But St. Luke does refer to Nazareth by name (Lk.iv.16). In St. John, Jesus' πατρίς is Judea (Jn.iv.44); but for a full discussion of the problems related to this Johannine passage, consult Meeks, "Galilee and Judea in the Fourth Gospel," pp. 163-66. According to Meeks, πατρίς is used here with the meaning of Jesus' "own land" rather than his "native land." A statistical analysis of the number of times Nazareth is mentioned by name in the Gospels reveals these results: Mt. 3, Mk. 1, Lk. 5, Jn. 2.

2. A count of the number of references to Galilee in the Gospels produces these figures: Mt. 16, Mk. 12, Lk. 14, Jn. 16. Of the twelve Marcan references, the First Evangelist adopts all but one.

Nazareth of Galilee" (= ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Mt. xxi. 11).[1] Also in Jerusalem, Peter is exposed in words that witness to Jesus' geographical origins: "You also were with Jesus the Galilean" (= Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου, Mt.xxvi.69=Mk.xiv.70); and "This man was with Jesus the Nazarene" (= Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου, Mt.xxvi.71=Mk.xiv.67).

Although essentially following his Marcan source, the First Evangelist occasionally underscores Galilee and thus implicitly emphasizes Jesus' Galilean origin. The most conspicuous instance of this added stress upon Galilee is the formula quotation from Isa.ix.1-2 which the Evangelist inserts into the episode of Jesus' first preaching in Galilee and thereby substantiates his resettlement in Capernaum by the sea (Mt.iv.12ff; see Mk.i.21, ii.1).[2] Again, by slight alterations of St. Mark, the Evangelist emphasizes that Galilee is the point of departure for Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. In introducing Jesus' second prediction of the passion, St. Mark reads: "They went on from there and passed through Galilee /on the way to Capernaum/" (Mk.ix.30). But the First Evangelist says: As they were gathering in Galilee, Jesus said to them . . . (Mt.xvii.22). So Galilee is the jumping off point for the trip southward. When Jesus finally undertakes the journey, St. Mark notes: "And he left there /that is, Capernaum/ and went to the region of Judea beyond the Jordan" (Mk.x.1). But the First Evangelist states: Now when Jesus had finished these sayings, he went away from Galilee (= ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας) and entered the region of Judea beyond the Jordan (Mt.xix.1). This manner of referring to Galilee is recalled in the Evangelist's words pertaining to Jesus'

---

1. But compare Mk.i.9.

2. For the text of this quotation and the way in which the First Evangelist has introduced it into his Marcan source, see above pp. 87-88.

crucifixion: There were also many women there, looking on from afar, who had followed Jesus from Galilee (= ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας) ministering to him (Mt.xxvii.55; compare Mk.xv.41).

In conclusion, therefore, although the First Evangelist carries forward the theme of Jesus' geographical origins in Nazareth of Galilee into the main body of his Gospel, he does not make a real issue of these origins.

The genealogical origins of Jesus and his earthly ministry (chapters i, iii-xxviii.15). Setting forth Jesus' genealogical origins in chapter one of the infancy account, the Evangelist shows how Jesus the virgin born Messiah was engrafted into the Davidic family. Beyond the infancy story itself, however, he makes no further reference to Jesus' miraculous birth.[1] But he does forcefully reiterate Jesus' Davidic sonship through the repetition of the title the Son of David.[2] After the infancy account (Mt.i-ii) up to Jesus' disputation with the Pharisees (Mt.xxi.41-46=Mk.xii.35-37), the phrase appears variously in the appeal for help by the two blind men (Mt.ix.27), in the question of the crowds (Mt.xii.23), on the lips of the Canaanite woman

---

1. Of particular interest in this regard is the Evangelist's interpretation of the Marcan story of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (Mt.xiii.53-58=Mk.vi.1-6a).. St. Mark reads: "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us"? (vs. 3). But the First Evangelist slightly alters this: Is not this the carpenter's son? (= ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός). Is not his mother called Mary? (vs.55). In Matthew i-ii, the Evangelist carefully avoided referring to Jesus as Joseph's child (as Mt.ii.11, 13, 14, 20, 21); but here he adopts over against St. Mark just such a reference. The suggestion by Allen that the Evangelist alters St. Mark's "carpenter" out of reverence for Jesus is not very convincing, Matthew, p. 155. But whatever the motive, the mention of Jesus as someone's son in this context probably would not bother him insofar as it appears on the lips of the unbelieving inhabitants of Nazareth.

2. The development of this theme through the Gospel has been exhaustively studied by J. M. Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'," NTS, X (1964), 446-64. The following remarks in this regard are greatly indebted to him. But it should be said that he is not approaching the Evangelist's use of the title strictly from the standpoint of Jesus' origins; so these two discussions are by no means identical.

(Mt.xv.22), in the plaintive cry of two more blind men (Mt.xxii.30, 31=Mk.x.47, 48), and in the praises of the Jerusalem crowds (Mt.xxi.9) and the children in the Temple (Mt.xxi.15). The expression Son of David, therefore, occurs in St. Matthew's portrayal of Jesus' ministry some eight times in seven different contexts. This stands in sharp contrast to St. Mark (and St. Luke) which records the phrase only three times in two different settings. So the First Evangelist's interest in Jesus' Davidic sonship reappears as a prominent theme in the body of his Gospel.

Insofar as there seems to be something of a premeditated development of this theme in the Gospel, it can best be examined by a consideration in order of the different passages in which it occurs.

In Mt.ix.27-31 two blind men beseech Jesus saying: "Have mercy on us, Son of David" (= Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὸς Δαυείδ, vs.27). When Jesus inquires whether they believe that he can help them, they reply: "Yes, Lord" (= Ναί, Κύριε). Jesus restores their sight; and although he charges them to secrecy, they spread abroad the report of this marvelous happening. Shortly thereafter Pharisees accuse Jesus of casting out demons in the name of the prince of demons (vs.34). This episode has no exact counterpart in St. Mark. It has been suggested, however, that the First Evangelist is here retelling his own story of the two blind men of Jericho which is based on the Marcan narrative of Bartimaeus (Mt.xx.29-34=Mk.x.46-52).[1] Essentially, therefore, this story is a Matthaean composition.

The next episode of Mt.xii.22-24 involves Jesus' healing of a blind and deaf demoniac. Truly amazed, all the people ask: "Can this be the Son of David?" (= Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυείδ, vs.23). Again the Pharisees accuse Jesus of exorcizing in the name of the prince of demons. Although the

---

1. Held, "Miracle Stories," pp. 219-20; also see Gibbs, "Son of David," pp. 453-56.

Evangelist is working with Marcan (compare Mk.iii.20-22) and "Q" (compare Lk.xi.14-16) material, this story too is essentially his composition.[1]

In Mt.xv.21-29 Jesus is approached by a Canaanite woman who asks for help for her demon-possessed daughter: "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David" (= Ἐλέησόν με Κύριε υἱὸς Δαυείδ , vs.22).[2] But Jesus' disciples are annoyed and request that she be sent away. To this Jesus proclaims: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (vs.24). But the woman persists: "Lord, help me" (= Κύριε βοήθει μοι , vs.25). Following a verbal exchange in which the woman again refers to him as Lord (= Κύριε vs.27; from Mk.vii.28), Jesus praises her for her faith and heals her daughter. The Matthaean story is the result of the Evangelist's extensive reworking of the Marcan episode of the Syrophoenician woman (Mk.vii.24-30). But much of the dialogue in the story is peculiar to the Matthaean version; and one of the chief contributions of the Evangelist is to contrast sharply the faithful Gentile with the lost sheep of the house of Israel.[3]

With Mt.xx.29-34 the First Evangelist presents his initial version of the Marcan account of Bartimaeus (Mk.x.46-52). As Jesus passes along the road near Jericho, two blind men repeatedly appeal to him: "Lord, have mercy on us, Son of David" (= Κύριε ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς υἱὸς Δαυείδ , vss.30, 31). Similarly phrased entreaties stand in the Marcan source: "'Son of David, (Jesus,) have mercy on me'" (= υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ (Ἰησοῦ) ἐλέησόν με ,vss. 47, 48).

---

1. Gibbs, "Son of David," pp. 453-56.

2. Heinz Held presents a detailed redaktionsgeschichtlich study of this Matthaean story, "Miracle Stories," pp. 197-200.

3. In this regard, J. M. Gibbs writes: "As we have seen, there are signs here in the Matthaean account of a continuing play on the expectation of the Messianic Davidic King. At this point Jesus is acknowledged as such by a Gentile, but Israel has yet to own him," "Son of David," p. 459.

After Jesus asks their need, the two men address him as Lord (= Κύριε, vs.33; but compare St. Mark Ῥαββουνεί, vs.51) and request their sight. Jesus complies. They follow him.

Immediately following this miracle story comes the entry into Jerusalem of Mt.xxi.1-9 (following Mk.xi.1-10). Having introduced the formula citation from Zech.ix.9 into the Marcan episode to underscore Jesus as the "meek king,"[1] the First Evangelist has the jubilant throng exclaim: "Hosanna to the son of David! (= ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ). Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest!" (vs.9). This mention is prompted by the Marcan reading: "'Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the kingdom of our father David that is coming! Hosanna in the highest!!!" (vss.9-10).

In Mt.xxi.10-17 Jesus enters the temple and drives out the merchants. Then the blind and the lame come forward to be healed. In response to this exhibition of Jesus' restorative power, children echo the cry expressed at his entry into Jerusalem: "Hosanna to the Son of David!" (= ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ, vs.15). The chief priests and scribes are indignant. This scene of Jesus' healing in the temple is peculiar to the First Gospel.

The Davidic sonship theme mounts to its appropriate climax with the story of Jesus' disputation with the Pharisees over the Davidic descent of the Messiah (Mt.xxii.41-46=Mk.xii.35-37=Lk.xx.41-44). But before an examination of this story, several observations are in order concerning the son of David motif developed up to this point.

Firstly, although the title Son of David by its very nature is indicative of Jesus' genealogical origins, and the First Evangelist would certainly

---

1. See the discussion on pp. 58-59.

so understand it, its primary usage in the body of the Gospel is not strictly speaking genealogical. Furthermore, with the exception of its application to Jesus by the cheering crowds at his Jerusalem entry (Mt.xxi.9), Son of David is not overtly used to stress Jesus' royal status. Instead, the name designates Jesus as one who miraculously heals the lame, the blind, the deaf, and the demon-possessed. The precedent for this understanding of Son of David, of course, is to be found in the Marcan account of Bartimaeus.[1] It is also this episode that provides the First Evangelist with the model for the expression: "Have mercy on me/us, Son of David" (Mt.ix.27; xv.22; xxii.30, 31).[2] But the First Evangelist has clearly made both this understanding of the title and this expression his own property; and one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Matthaean Davidic sonship stories is the way in which the supplicants call Jesus Lord (Mt.ix.28; xv.22, 25, 27; xx.30, 31, 33) rather than "Jesus" (Mk.x.47) or "Rabbi" (Mk.x.51).

Secondly, those who refer to Jesus as Son of David include the sick (Mt.ix.27; xxii.30, 31), the crowds (Mt.xii.23; xxi.9), the children (Mt.xxi.15), and the Canaanite woman (Mt.xv.22). The twelve disciples, therefore, do

---

1. The notion that the Davidic Messiah would be a miracle worker is foreign to first century Jewish messianic speculation. Noting the prominence of this theme in St. Matthew, Reginald Fuller concludes: "It looks as though we have here a specific theme of the church's Christology, in which the Davidic sonship expresses Jesus' function as the merciful healer," NT Christology, p. 111. Fuller explicates the emergence of this christological motif in this way: "But, as we shall see, in the earlier Palestinian tradition the Davidic sonship of Jesus was first connected with the parousia. The earthly Davidic sonship is a later development in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity. The story of the blind Bartimaeus marks the beginning of this Hellenistic Jewish Christian development," ibid., pp. 111-12. In other words: "What seems to have happened is that in at any rate some circles of Hellenistic Jewish Christianity the term Son of David has taken over the functions of the Mosaic prophet-servant," ibid., p. 189.

2. But the verb "to have mercy" (ἐλεέω) is rather common in the First Gospel: Mt.9; Mk.3; Lk.4; Jn.0. Gibbs, "Son of David," p. 449.

not address Jesus as Son of David. But the decisive contrast in these stories is not between this diverse group and the twelve, but rather between them and the irresponsive Jewish leaders (as Mt.ix.34; xii.24; xxi.15). J. M. Gibbs is probably right in his suggestion that "it is Matthew's intention for his readers to infer that the Pharisees and other Jewish leaders who are present at the healings and exorcisms under discussion have the spiritual counterpart to the physical disability cured by Jesus."[1]

The controversy over the Davidic origin of the Messiah is taken over from St. Mark--but not without interpretation. A comparison between the Matthaean and the Marcan versions of the story is enlightening:

> Now when the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question, saying, "What do you think of the Christ? Whose son is he?" They said to him, "The son of David." He said to them, "How is it that David inspired by the Spirit, calls him Lord, saying,
> 'The Lord said to my Lord,
> Sit at my right hand, till I
> put thy enemies under thy
> feet?'
> If David thus calls him Lord, how is he his son?" And no one was able to answer him a word, nor from that day did anyone dare to ask him any more questions. (Mt.xxii.41-46)

> And as Jesus taught in the temple, he said,
> "How can the scribes say that the Christ is
> the son of David?
> David himself inspired by the Holy Spirit, declared,
> 'The Lord said to my Lord
> Sit at my right hand, till I
> put thy enemies under thy
> feet.'
> David himself calls him Lord; so how is he his son? And the great throng heard him gladly. (Mk.xii.35-37)

With this story the Davidic sonship theme is once again viewed genealogically. The questions of the historical basis for and the Marcan under-

---

1. "Son of David," p. 452.

standing of Jesus' words in this matter have been much discussed.[1] But whatever the solution to these questions, it is obvious that the First Evangelist does not perceive in them a denial of Jesus' Davidic origin. Both with his genealogy and the repeated usage of the title Son of David he has underlined Jesus' Davidic lineage. But the question remains: how does he understand this story? It would appear that he has used it as a two-edged sword.

On the one hand, he again condemns the Pharisees for not recognizing Jesus as the Son of David.[2] The principal alteration of the Marcan episode by the First Evangelist is the group to whom Jesus is speaking. In St. Mark he is teaching the joyful crowds; but in St. Matthew he is locked in earnest debate with his old antagonists the Pharisees. It is to them that Jesus pointedly directs his two part question of the Messiah's sonship.[3] The Pharisees knowingly reply: "Of David" (= Τοῦ Δαυείδ, vs.42). With his version of the story, therefore, the First Evangelist injects a bit of irony.

---

1. Consult the following: Fuller, NT Christology, p. 111; Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (rev. ed.; "The New Testament Library"; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 130-33; and Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951-55), I, p. 28. Although Cullmann sees a genuine dominical saying behind this account, both Bultmann and Fuller are not quite so certain. The latter attributes it to the Hellenistic Jewish Christian Church.

2. The way in which the First Evangelist uses this story to condemn the Pharisees (and in a sense to demonstrate Jesus' messiahship) has a remarkable counterpart in his employment of the Magi episode (Mt.ii.1ff). Furthermore, both stories show that the First Evangelist is capable of irony. See above, pp. 135-36.

3. The division of the single Marcan question is characteristic of the First Evangelist's literary style. He has a predilection for forming and enlarging upon conversation. So Held, "Miracle Stories," pp. 236-37. This stylistic tendency, therefore, complements his usual curtailment of narrative details.

Messianic dogma informs the learned Pharisees of the Messiah's Davidic origin; yet when the Son of David himself appears, they fail to recognize him. The blindness of the Pharisees is thrown into relief by the perceptiveness of the lowly outcasts, the children, and even the Gentile woman. The important role this episode plays in the First Evangelist's general indictment of the Pharisees is further suggested by its placement in the Gospel. With its closing verse as an appropriate transitional phrase (Mt.xxii.46; compare Mk.37b), the scene introduces Jesus' woeful tirade against these hypocritical religionists (Mt.xxiii.1ff). Insofar as the Evangelist uses the story as an indictment of the Pharisees, there is a certain continuity between it and the preceding episodes which contain the Davidic sonship theme.

On the other hand, however, the Evangelist not only condemns the Pharisees for not greeting Jesus as the Son of David but also reproaches them for suggesting that the Messiah will be the Son of David. This is achieved by repeating without substantial alteration Jesus' quotation and exegesis of Ps.cx.1. So although the Evangelist has strongly affirmed Jesus' Davidic lineage, he now intimates that his messiahship is not to be defined solely (or principally) in terms of Davidic sonship. Jesus is indeed the Davidic Messiah, but more than the Davidic Messiah! That thoughts similar to these must be involved in the Evangelist's understanding of this story is supported by the fact that in the Gospel Jesus is never again called Son of David. So there is also a certain discontinuity between this episode and the preceding stories which stressed Jesus' Davidic sonship.

It might seem in order, therefore, to confront the First Evangelist with a question similar to that raised by Rudolf Bultmann: "What, then, is the implied but unexpressed Messiah-concept out of which the title 'son of David'

is criticized?"[1] J. M. Gibbs is replying to just such a question when he writes:

> Matthew sharpens the issue of to whom the Christ (that is, Jesus to Matthew's readers) owes filial obedience and from whom he receives his sonship. Also, the Christ is, according to Matthew's version, basically son of someone, of someone to whom he owes obedience and whose character he is to manifest, and the one who controls the nature of his sonship is not David. Clearly, he can only be "Son of God", an acclamation which the Pharisees refuse to make.[2]

According to Gibbs, therefore, the Son of God concept is the idea out of which the Davidic sonship dogma is criticized. The cue which prompts this conclusion is the Matthaean form of Jesus' questions: "What do you think of the Christ? Whose son is he?" (vs.42.). Certainly if the Evangelist were replying to these twin questions, he might well say, "Son of God."[3] But the real point of these queries in their Matthaean context is to set up the reply of the Pharisees: "Of David" (vs.42). What is involved from the Evangelist's point of view is a calling into question of the adequacy of this reply. Over against Bultmann, one must ask: is the Messiah-concept (or the christological concept) out of which the title Son of David is criticized really unexpressed? Consequently, over against Gibbs one must inquire: is the Son of God idea the Messiah-concept (or the christological concept) out of which the title Son of David is criticized? It seems quite likely that the concept which lies at the heart of the First Evangelist's critique of the Davidic sonship idea is to be found within the story itself--in Jesus' exegesis of Ps.cx.1. Jesus asks:

---

1. Theology of the NT, I, 28.

2. "Son of David," p. 461.

3. For the significance of this name and idea in the First Gospel, consult the discussion by Edward P. Blair, Jesus in Matthew, pp. 58-68. The title Son of God is applied to Jesus some nine times (Mt.iv.3, 6; viii.28; xiv.33; xvi.16; xxvi.63; xxvii.40, 43, 54). Several of these references are peculiar to St. Matthew (notably Mt.xiv.33 and xvi.16).

"If David thus calls him /that is, the Messiah/ Lord, how is he /that is, the Messiah/ his /that is, David's/ son?" (vs.45). In contradistinction to his Marcan source, the First Evangelist twice reports Jesus' interpretation of the Psalm (Mt.xxii.43, 45; compare Mk.xii.37). Thereby he underscores its significance. Accordingly, from the Evangelist's viewpoint, the Messiah is not simply Son of David. He is Lord! That the Evangelist would see the issue pre-eminently in terms of "not only Son of David, but also Lord" is further suggested by the miracle stories in which he brings the Davidic sonship motif to the fore. Therein the only other form of address directed to Jesus is Lord.

Günther Bornkamm has convincingly demonstrated that "the title and address of Jesus as κύριος in Matthew have throughout the character of a divine Name of Majesty."[1] Furthermore, this name is the title par excellence used by the disciples with reference to Jesus. In this regard, Bornkamm observes that "it is very significant that though Matthew frequently uses the title διδάσκαλος or alternatively ῥαββί , he never uses it as a mode of expression in the mouth of the disciples, with one exception--Judas Iscariot /so Mt.xxvi.25, 49/. The Pharisees and strangers call him διδάσκαλε . His disciples call him κύριε ."[2] It is generally recognized that the First Evangelist sees the predicament of the Church mirrored in the situation of the disciples.[3] The rather careful and consistent placement of the title Lord on

---

1. "End-Expectation," pp. 42-43.

2. Ibid., p. 41.

3. For example: Barth, "Law," pp. 110-11; and Davies, Sermon on the Mount, pp. 94ff. Nowhere is the situation of the later Church reflected in the predicament of the disciples any more clearly than in the story of the storm at sea (Mt.viii.23ff). See Bornkamm, "Stilling of the Storm," pp. 52ff.

the lips of the disciples probably also reflects the (liturgical or homiletical?) usage of the Matthaean community; for it is just this name that connotes the kind of relationship experienced between that community and the Exalted Jesus who is ever present.[1] In using the story of Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees over the Davidic sonship of the Messiah, the Evangelist is not actually putting one Messiah-concept (or christological concept) over against another. Rather he is calling into question a narrow Davidic messianism from the perspective of Jesus' Lordship with the recognition that the title Son of David is quite insufficient to describe the relationship between the Exalted Jesus and his people. The title Son of David, therefore, is here set aside from a perspective similar to that which dominates the closing scene of the Gospel (Mt.xxviii.16-20). The only difference is that here the Exalted Lord is called Lord, whereas there he is implicitly called Emmanuel.

In conclusion, although the First Evangelist does not make a real issue of Jesus' genealogical origins in the body of his Gospel, he does reiterate his interest in Jesus' genealogical origins by his use of the title Son of David. But he consciously lays it aside as inadequate in the face of the recognition of Jesus as Lord.

Matthew i-ii and the Individuality of the First Gospel

For the composition of their respective Gospels, both the First Evangelist and Luke had access to the Gospel of St. Mark. Yet both of them

---

1. The appropriateness of the title κύριος in this regard is noted by Oscar Cullmann in these words: "In designating Jesus as the Kyrios the first Christians declared that he is not only a part of divine Heilsgeschichte in the past, nor just the object of future hope, but a living reality in the present. . . ." Christology of the NT, p. 195.

preface their redactions of their Marcan source with certain--albeit quite different-infancy traditions. Furthermore, Luke compiled the Book of Acts as a second volume to complement his Gospel. The theological motives which prompted the incorporation of the infancy traditions into these literary works were also quite different. A comparison between the way in which the Matthaean infancy account is related to the First Gospel and the way in which the Lucan birth narrative is related to Luke-Acts, therefore, brings into view the individuality of the former Gospel.[1]

1. With Luke i-ii (actually Luke i.5-ii.52) Luke portrays that period in salvation history before the ministry of Jesus as the Epoch of Israel. The frequent references to Jesus' Davidic descent serve to show that he is indeed the Messiah promised by God to his people Israel (i.27, 32, 69; ii.4, 11). The notion of Jesus' conception of the Holy Spirit, however, is used to contrast Jesus with the Epoch of Israel. It distinguishes Jesus from John and the other pious Israelites who represent the Epoch of Israel. Elizabeth (i.41), Zachariah (i.67), and Simeon (ii.25, 26, 27) are filled with the prophetic Spirit. Similarly, John the messianic forerunner is filled with the prophetic Spirit (i.15); and because of his seizure by the Holy Spirit, John is called "the prophet of the Most High" (i.76). But Jesus is not filled with the prophetic Spirit. He is conceived of the creative Spirit (i.35); therefore, he is "the Son of the Most High" (i.32), "the Son of God "(i.35). So both the stress upon Jesus' Davidic lineage and the idea of his virginal

---

1. The basis for the following comments concerning Luke's usage of his infancy traditions and the relationship between Luke i-ii and the remainder of Luke-Acts has been developed at some length by the present writer in an article, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," which is soon to appear in New Testament Studies.

conception serve Luke's interest in characterizing the Epoch of Israel and defining Jesus' relation to it. He is the fulfilment of the Epoch of Israel but (unlike John, etc.) does not belong entirely to it; for with his coming ministry a new stage in the story of salvation is inaugurated.

But with Matthew i-ii, the First Evangelist demonstrates the messianic origins of Jesus Christ. Genealogically Jesus' origins are two-dimensional: descent from David and conception of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, Jesus can appropriately be called the Son of David (i.1) and Emmanuel (i.23). So both the recognition of Jesus' Davidic lineage and the affirmation of his virginal conception serve the Evangelist's concern for Jesus' messianic origins.

2. Luke i.5-ii.52 does not, strictly speaking, comprise the preface to either the Gospel or Luke-Acts. Reflecting a style common among both Roman and Greek writers in the Hellenistic age, Luke i.1-4 is that preface. From a theological viewpoint, Luke i.5-ii.52 is the first of three main divisions in Luke's two volume magnum opus. Having portrayed the Epoch of Israel (Lk.i.5-ii.52), Luke presents the Epoch of Jesus' Ministry (Lk.iii-xxiv) and the Epoch of the Church (Acts i-xxviii). Therefore, it is essentially a salvation history motive that leads to his adoption of the infancy traditions. The red thread that connects the various periods of salvation history and thus runs through Luke-Acts is the Holy Spirit. In the infancy account (Lk.i.5-ii.52), the prophetic Spirit relates itself to a few chosen individuals who herald Jesus' advent (i.15, 41, 67; ii.25, 26, 27); and the creative Spirit forms Jesus in the womb of his mother (i.35). During Jesus' ministry (Lk.iii-xxiv), the messianic Spirit rests upon him, the bearer of the Spirit (iii.21; iv.1, 14, 18; x.21). The heavenly ascension of Jesus separates the Epoch of His Ministry from the Epoch of the Church (Lk.xxiv.50ff; Acts i.9). But Jesus promises to his disciples the gift of the Spirit

(Lk.xxiv.49; Acts i.8). With the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost the Church is constituted as the Community of the Spirit (ii.1ff). The Holy Spirit again manifests itself primarily as the prophetic Spirit: bringing divine revelation (Acts viii.29; x.19; xiii.2; xvi.6; xxi.11) and inspiring preaching (Acts ii.4; iv.8, 31; vi.10; xiii.9). Only now, in contrast to the experience of the prophetic Spirit during the Epoch of Israel, everyone receives the Spirit and is thus a prophet (Acts ii.4, 17; iv.31; v.32; viii.17; x.44ff; xiii.52; xv.8; xix.2, 6).

But Matthew i-ii constitutes the preface of the First Gospel. These chapters deal with the all important but preliminary questions: From whom? From where? By answering these queries at the outset of his Gospel, the First Evangelist establishes the basis for the authority Jesus the Messiah will manifest both in his earthly ministry--and beyond! Theologically considered, it is a rather straightforward christological motive that prompts the First Evangelist to begin his Gospel with the infancy traditions. The red thread that runs through the entire Gospel is Jesus himself. Jesus is the leading actor both in the infancy account (Mt,i-ii) and, of course, in the story of his ministry (Mt.iii-xxviii.15). But more significantly, even beyond his ministry Jesus is the prominent figure (Mt.xxviii.16-20). In the First Gospel, there is no heavenly ascension--although the closing verses suggest an enthronement over all the heavens and the earth. Again, there is no bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Rather Jesus himself is present among his disciples even to the close of the present age.

CONCLUSION

This redaktionsgeschichtlich examination of the Matthaean infancy account began with the acknowledgement of certain core assumptions relative to the entire Gospel. At several points this study has confirmed their cogency.

With its four LITERARY FORMS arranged into six carefully contrived LITERARY UNITS, the Matthaean infancy account possesses literary and theological coherence. The literary style and vocabulary of these chapters are in accordance with the literary style and vocabulary of the First Evangelist and/or his Gospel. The two christological themes of utmost import in these chapters reappear elsewhere in the Gospel: Jesus as the Son of David and as Emmanuel or "God with us." Therefore, it is unlikely that either the infancy story or any part thereof is a post-Matthaean addition to the First Gospel.

Furthermore, the repetition of the aforementioned christological themes throughout the First Gospel suggests that this Gospel is secondary to St. Mark and uses the latter as a written source. The emphases upon Jesus as the Son of David and as Emmanuel or "God with us" are, for the most part, lacking in the Marcan Gospel. Literarily, this state of affairs can best be explained by the premise that the First Evangelist has worked them into his Marcan source, not with the assumption that Mark has excised them from his Matthaean material. For instance, the two Matthaean stories of the two blind

men which stress Jesus' Davidic sonship appear to be based upon the Marcan account of Bartimaeus (Mt.ix.27-31, xx.29-34; compare Mk.x.46-52).

With the Matthaean infancy traditions, the First Evangelist strives to establish Jesus' origins as the Davidic Messiah. Perhaps this affords slight evidence for the assumption that the Gospel itself originated in Syria--at least in contradistinction to Alexandria and/or Egypt. According to the witness of Philo (died ca. a.d. 50), Alexandrian Hellenistic Judaism was little concerned with specifically Davidic messianic speculation. In fact, it is debatable whether Philo makes any reference to a personal Messiah--much less to a Messiah of Davidic descent (see Rewards xvi.95; xxix.165; compare Conf. xxviii.149). Also, according to the testimony of the Epistle of Barnabas (ca. a.d. 130), if it be of Alexandrian origin, early Alexandrian Christianity was little interested in Jesus' Davidic sonship (see xii.8-11). But Ignatius of Antioch (died ca.117) underscores Jesus' Davidic sonship as well as his virginal conception and birth (for example, Eph.xviii.2-xix.2). These observations, however, are preliminary. The question of the light the First Evangelist's preoccupation with Jesus' origins as the Davidic Messiah sheds upon the Gospel's place of origin is one that calls for further investigation.

Among the four LITERARY FORMS which comprise the Matthaean infancy story, the genealogy and the introductory formulas are particularly instructive for an understanding of the cultural and religious milieu of the First Evangelist and his Gospel. Both of these forms have achieved their present shape in a Hellenistic Jewish Christian rather than a Hellenistic Gentile Christian environment. The genealogy exalts Abraham as well as David. The introductory formulas have their closest parallels in the Rabbinic writings. Insofar as these two LITERARY FORMS are essentially of Matthaean origin, they

indicate that the First Evangelist is a Jewish rather than a Gentile Christian and that his Gospel is a Jewish Christian Gospel. In support of this conclusion is the basic theological motivation behind the Evangelist's use of the infancy traditions: the establishment of Jesus' origins as the Davidic Messiah! Furthermore, the fact that virtually the only Christian and/or Jewish parallels to the introductory formulas are to be found in the Rabbinic literature lends a certain credence to the view occasionally advanced that the First Evangelist is a converted Rabbi. In this regard, another possibility for further research is a more exhaustive consideration of the introductory formula as a distinct literary form. The results might throw into greater relief the uniqueness of the pattern shared by the Matthaean fulfilment formulas and certain Rabbinic introductory statements. But the results could demonstrate that the pattern of the Matthaean formulas does not necessarily point to the Evangelist's Rabbinic training. Although the First Gospel is the handiwork of a Jewish Christian, its closing pericope makes it quite clear that neither the First Evangelist nor his community is turned inward to the exclusion of the Gentiles. Discipleship is intended and destined for the world at large.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts and Lexicons

Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaption of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Fourth revised and augmented edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1907.

Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.

Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Translated by Geza Vermes from the 2d ed. ("Meridian Books.") Cleveland-New York: The World Publishing Company, 1962.

Grant, Robert M. (ed.). The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary. 6 vols. Camden, N. J.: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964—.

Hawkins, John C. Horae Synopticae. 2d ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909.

Huck, Albert. Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. 9th ed. Revised by Hans Lietzmann. English edition by F. L. Cross. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. 2 vols. New York: Pardes Publishing House, Inc., 1950.

Josephus, Flavius. Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, et al. 9 vols. ("The Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926—.

_____. The Life and Works of Josephus. Translated by William Whiston. Philadelphia-Toronto: The John C. Winston Company, 1957.

Kilpatrick, G. D. (ed.). Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ . 2d ed. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958.

Kittel, Rudolf, et al. (ed.). Biblia Hebraica. 7th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.

Legg, S. C. E. Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium Secundum Matthaeum. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1940.

Lewis, Agnes Smith (ed.). The Old Syriac Gospels. London: Williams and Norgate, 1910.

Lightfoot, John. Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae. 4 vols. New ed. by Robert Gandell. Oxford: The University Press, 1859.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926.

Nestle, Eberhard, et al. (ed.). Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Philo. Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. and 2 suppl. vols. ("The Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929—.

Pritchard, James B. (ed.). Ancient Near Eastern Texts. 2d ed. Princeton, N. J.: University Press, 1955.

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.) Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Strack, Herman L., and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 5 vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922—.

Throckmorton, Jr., Burton H. (ed.). Gospel Parallels: A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. 2d ed. rev. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1957.

Vermes, Geza. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1962.

Commentaries

Allen, W. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. 3d ed. ("The International Critical Commentary.") Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Argyle, A. W. The Gospel According to Matthew. ("The Cambridge Bible Commentary.") Cambridge: The University Press, 1963.

Bonnard, Pierre. L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu. ("Commentaire du Nouveau Testament.") Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestle, 1963.

Filson, Floyd V. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries.") New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960.

Gaechter, Paul. Das Matthäus Evangelium. Innsbruch-Wien-München: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963.

Johnson, Sherman. Matthew. (12 vols.; "The Interpreter's Bible."). New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1951.

Jones, Alexander. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965.

Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Matthieu. 8th ed. ("Études Bibliques.") Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1948.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Edited by Werner Schmauch. ("Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament," founded by H. A. W. Meyer.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Loisy, Alfred. Les Évangiles Synoptiques. 2 vols. The author: Ceffonds (Haute-Marne), 1907-8.

M'Neile, A. H. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1915.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 2 vols. ("Prophezei: Schweizerisches Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde.") Zürich: Zwingli-verlag, 1948.

Micklem, Philip A. St. Matthew. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1917.

Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. 2d ed. rev. London: Macmillan and Co., 1927.

Plummer, Alfred. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. London: Robert Scott, 1911.

Robinson, T. H. The Gospel of Matthew. ("The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.") Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1928.

Schlatter, Adolf. Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Zeil, seine Selbständigkeit. 3d ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948.

Schniewind, Julius. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. ("Das Neue Testament Deutsch.") Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950.

Stendahl, Krister. "Matthew," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1962. Pp. 769-98.

Zahn, Theodor. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. 4th ed. ("Kommentar zum Neuen Testament," 1) Leipzig: Diechertsche, 1922.

General Works

Anderson, Hugh. Jesus and Christian Origins: a Commentary on Modern Viewpoints. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Bacon, B. W. Studies in Matthew. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930.

Barrett, C. K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: S.P.C.K., 1947.

Barthélemy, Dominique. Les Devanciers d'Aquila. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum," 10.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

Beare, Frank W. The Earliest Records of Jesus. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.

_____. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.

Blair, Edward P. Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Bonsirven, Joseph. Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by William Wolf. New York-Chicago-San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Boslooper, Thomas. The Virgin Birth. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

Brandon, S. G. F. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. London: S.P.C.K., 1951.

Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951-55.

Burkitt, F. C. Evangelion da-Mepharreshe. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1904.

_____. The Gospel History and its Transmission. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907.

Butler, B. C. The Originality of St Matthew: a Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis. Cambridge: The University Press, 1951.

Chadwick, H. Munro, and N. Kershaw Chadwick. The Growth of Literature. 3 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1932-40.

Chevallier, Max-Alain. L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament. ("Études d'Historie et de Philosophie Religieuses," 49.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.

Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Rev. ed. ("The New Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Dalman, Gustaf. The Words of Jesus. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: The Athlone Press, 1956.

Davies, W. D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. 2d ed. rev. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952.

Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 2 vols. 8th ed. rev. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.

Edwards, Douglas. The Virgin Birth in History and Faith. London: Faber & Faber Limited, 1943.

Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

Farmer, William R. The Synoptic Problem: a Critical Analysis. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Förster, Werner. Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times. Translated by Gordon E. Harris. Edinburgh-London: Oliver and Boyd, 1964.

Franzmann, Martin H. Follow Me: Discipleship According to Saint Matthew. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961.

Freed, Edwin D. Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John. ("Supplements to Novum Testamentum," 11.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Fuller, Reginald. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Goldstein, Morris. Jesus in the Jewish Tradition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. Matthew: Apostle and Evangelist. Philadelphia-Toronto: The John C. Winston Company, 1959.

Grant, F. C. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959.

_____. The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Grant, Robert M. The Formation of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Guignebert, Ch. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1939.

Gutzwiller, Richard. Jesus der Messias: Christus im Matthäus-Evangeliums. Einsiedeln-Zürich-Köln: Benziger Verlag, 1949.

Hahn, Ferdinand. Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum. ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," 83.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Jeremias, Joachim. Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt. (Mt.23, 29; Lk.11, 47). Eine Untersuchung zur Volksreligion der Zeit Jesu. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

_____. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Translated by S. H. Hooke ("Studies in Biblical Theology.") London: SCM Press, 1958.

Johnson, Sherman. Jesus in His Homeland. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.

Kaylor, Robert David. "The Ascension Motif in Luke-Acts, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1964.

Kilpatrick, G. D. The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.

Klausner, Joseph. The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah. Translated from the third Hebrew edition by W. F. Stinespring. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.

Knox, W. L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. Edited by H. Chadwick. 2 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953-57.

Kruijf, Th. de. Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums. ("Analecta Biblica," 16.) Romae: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1962.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm. Translated by A. J. Matill, Jr. from the 14th revised edition. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Laurentin, René. Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II. ("Études Bibliques") Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1957.

Lidzbarski, Mark. Mandäische Liturgien. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920.

Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Lindblom, J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962.

Liver, Jacob. The House of David: From the Fall of the Kingdom of Judah to the Fall of the Second Commonwealth and After. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1959.

Lobstein, Paul. The Virgin Birth of Christ. Edited by W. D. Morrison. Translated by Victor Lieuliette, 1903.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Galiläa und Jerusalem. ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," n.s. 34.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.

_____. Gottesknecht und Davidssohn. 2d ed. ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," n.s. 43.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.

Machen, J. Gresham. The Virgin Birth of Christ. 2d ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932.

Marxsen, Willi. Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums. ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," n.s. 49.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Matthews, Shailer. New Testament Times in Palestine. New and revised ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.

Metzger, Bruce M. An Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Moffatt, James. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. 3d ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

Montefiore, Hugh. Josephus and the New Testament. ("Contemporary Studies in Theology," 6.) London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Limited, 1962.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30.

Moule, C. F. D. The Birth of the New Testament. ("Harper's New Testament Commentaries.") New York-Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Nepper-Christensen, Poul. Das Matthäusevangelium: Ein Judenchristliches Evangelium? ("Acta Theologica Danica," 1.) Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958.

Price, James L. Interpreting the New Testament. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis: a Commentary. Translated by John H. Marks. ("The Old Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

_____. Old Testament Theology. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962-65.

Ringgren, Helmer. The Messiah in the Old Testament. ("Studies in Biblical Theology.") London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1956.

Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. ("Studies in Biblical Theology.") London: SCM Press, 1957.

Russell, D. S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. ("The Old Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Sandmel, Samuel. Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1956.

Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. 5 vols. in 2 divisions. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament. ("Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis," 20.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954.

Stonehouse, Ned Bernard. The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Guardian, 1944.

Strecker, Georg. Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus. ("Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," 82.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels: a Study of Origins. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1924.

Sweet, Louis Matthews. The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1906.

Taylor, Vincent. The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1920.

_____. The Text of the New Testament. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961.

Trilling, Wolfgang. Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums. ("Studien Zum Alten und Neuen Testament," 10.) München: Kösel-Verlag, 1964.

Via, Jr., Dan Otto. "The Doctrine of the Church in the Gospel of Matthew." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1955.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. Philo. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Woude, A. S. van der. Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran. ("Studia Semitica Neerlandica," 3.) Assen, Niederlande: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1957.

Articles and Essays

Albright, W. F. "The Names 'Nazareth' and 'Nazoraean'," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 397-401.

Barth, Gerhard. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. ("The New Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963. Pp. 58-164.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische: Mt 28, 16-20," Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Edited by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964. Pp. 171-91.

_____. "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. ("The New Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963. Pp. 15-51.

_____. "The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. ("The New Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963. Pp. 52-57.

Bourke, Myles. "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (1960), 160-75.

Bowman, R. A. "Genealogy," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press. II, 362-65.

Brinktrine, Johannes. "Gn 2, 4a, Überschrift oder Unterschrift?," Biblische Zeitschrift, IX (1965), 277.

Bruns, J. E. "The Magi Episode in Matthew 2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (1961), 51-54.

Burkitt, F. C. "The Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names," Proceedings of the British Academy, V (1911-12), 377-408.

Cavaletti, S. "I sogni di San Giuseppe," Bibbia e Oriente, II (1960), 149-51.

Cave, C. H. "St. Matthew's Infancy Narrative," New Testament Studies, IX (1963), 382-90.

Childs, Brevard S. "The Birth of Moses," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1965), 109-22.

Clark, Kenneth W. "Galilee," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. II, 344-47.

_____. "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (1947), 165-72.

Coppens, Joseph. "La prophétie d'Emmanuel," L'Attente du Messie. ("Recherches Bibliques.") Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954. Pp. 39-50.

Daube, David. "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," New Testament Studies, V (1959), 174-87.

Descamps, Albert. "Le Messianisme royal dans le Nouveau Testament," L'Attente du Messie. ("Recherches Bibliques.") Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954. Pp. 57-84.

Dibelius, Martin. "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium," Botschaft und Geschichte ("Zur Evangelienforschungen.") Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953. I, 1-78.

Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXVII (1928), 338-48.

Dupont, Jacques. "La genealogia di Gesù secondo Matteo 1, 1-17," Bibbia e Oriente, IV (1962), 3-6.

Earp, J. W. "Index of Names," Philo. (10 vols. and 2 supplementary vols.; "The Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929—. X, 269-433.

Edgar, S. L. "New Testament and Rabbinic Messianic Interpretation," New Testament Studies, V (1958), 47-54.

_____. "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament," New Testament Studies, IX (1962), 55-62.

Enslin, Morton S. "The Christian Stories of the Nativity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940), 317-38.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, VII (1961), 297-333.

Gärtner, Bertil. "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of St. Matthew," Studia Theologica, VIII (1954), 1-24.

Gibbs, J. M. "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'," New Testament Studies, X (1964), 446-64.

Goodman, F. W. "Sources of the First Two Chapters in Matthew and Luke," Church Quarterly Review, CLXII (1961), 136-43.

Grobel, Kendrick. "Gospels," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. II, 449.

Held, Heinz Joachim. "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. ("The New Testament Library.") Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963. Pp. 165-296.

Hillyer, Norman. "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," Evangelical Quarterly, XXXVI (1964), 12-26.

Johnson, Sherman. "The Biblical Quotations in Matthew," Harvard Theological Review, XXXVI (1943), 135-53.

Krämer, Michael. "Die Menschwerdung Jesu Christi nach Matthäus (Mt 1): Sein Anliegen und sein literarisches Verfahren," Biblica, XLV (1964), 1-50.

Krentz, Edgar. "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Toward the Structure of the First Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 409-14.

Kuhn, G. "Die Geschlechtsregister Jesu bei Lukas und Matthäus, nach ihrer Herkunft untersucht," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXII (1923), 206-28.

Leaney, A. R. C. "The Birth Narratives in St. Luke and St. Matthew," New Testament Studies, VIII (1962), 158-66.

Leroy, Herbert. "'Sein Name wird sein Emmanuel!' Die Kindheitsgeschichte nach Matthäus," Bibel und Kirche, XIX (1964), 110-17.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. "'Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt!' Eine exegese von Mt. 28, 16-20," In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer. Edted by Werner Schmauch. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk GmbH., 1951. Pp.22-49.

Meeks, Wayne A. "Galilee and Judea in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), 159-69.

Metzger, Bruce. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 297-307.

_____. "On the Citation of Variant Readings of Matt 1 16," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 361-63.

Meysing, Jacques. "Contribution à l'étude des généalogies bibliques. Technique de la composition des chronologies babyloniennes du déluge," Revue des Sciences Religieuses, XXXIX (1965), 209-29.

Michel, Otto. "Der Abschluss der Matthäusevangeliums," Evangelische Theologie, X (1950-51), 16-26. N.V.

Milton, Helen. "The Structure of the Prologue to St. Matthew's Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXI (1962), 175-81.

Minear, Paul. "The Interpreter and the Nativity Stories," Theology Today, VII (1950), 358-75.

Moore, George Foot. "Fourteen Generations: 490 Years," Harvard Theological Review, XIV (1921), 97-103.

_____. "Nazarene and Nazareth," The Beginnings of Christianity. Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 3 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-26. Pp. 426-32.

Muñoz Iglesias, Salvador. "Los Evangelios de la Infancia, y les Infancias de los Héroes," Estudios Bíblicos, XVI (1957), 5-36.

_____. "El género literario del Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," Estudios Bíblicos, XII (1958), 243-73.

Oliver, H. H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, X (1964), 202-26.

O'Rourke, John J. "The Fulfilment Texts in Matthew," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIV (1962), 394-403.

Pascual, Enrique. "La Genealogía de Jesús según S. Mateo," Estudios Bíblicos, XXIII (1964), 109-49.

Pine, L. G. "Genealogy," Collier's Encyclopedia. 24 vols. New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1962. X, 613-17.

Piper, Otto A. "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII (1959), 115-124.

Racette, Jean. "L'évangile de l'enfance selon saint Matthieu," Sciences Ecclésiastiques, IX (1957), 77-82.

Ramlot, Léon. "Les généalogies bibliques: Un genre litteraire oriental," Bible et Vie Chrétienne, LX (1964), 53-70.

Rengsdorf, Karl Heinrich. "Old and New Testament Traces of a Formula of the Judean Royal Ritual," Novum Testamentum, V (1962), 229-44.

Sanders, J. A. "ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ in Matt 2 23," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1965), 169-72.

Schille, Gottfried. "Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. II. Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus," New Testament Studies, IV (1958), 101-14.

Schweizer, Eduard. "'Er wird Nazoräer heissen' (zu Mc 1 24 Mt 2 23)," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. Pp. 90-93.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Mark's Contribution to the Quest of the Historical Jesus," New Testament Studies, X (1964), 421-32.

Seeligmann, I. L. "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese," Congress Volume: Copenhagen, 1953. ("Supplements to Vetus Testamentum," 1.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.

Seitz, Oscar J. F. "Gospel Prologues: A Common Pattern?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 262-68.

Smith, Harold. "Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται," Journal of Theological Studies, XXVIII (1927), 60.

Sparks, H. F. D. "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 241-62.

Stendahl, Krister. "Quis et unde? An Analysis of Mt 1-2," Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. Pp. 94-105.

Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies. Submitted to the publisher.

Teeple, Howard M. "The Origin of the Son of Man Christology," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1965), 213-50.

Thompson, P. J. "The Infancy Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke Compared," Studia Evangelica. Edited by Kurt Aland, et al. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," 73.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959. Pp. 217-22.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Dominus Vobiscum," New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson 1893-1958. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: The University Press, 1958. Pp. 270-305.

Vögtle, Anton. "Die Genealogie Mt, 1, 2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte (I. Teil)," Biblische Zeitschrift, VIII (1964), 45-58.

_____. "Die Genealogie Mt, 1, 2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte (II. Teil)," Biblische Zeitschrift, VIII (1964), 239-62.

_____. "Die Genealogie Mt, 1, 2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte (Schlussteil)," Biblische Zeitschrift, IX (1965), 32-49. N.V.

Wilson, Robert McL. "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narrative," Studia Evangelica. Edited by Kurt Aland, et al. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," 73.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959. Pp. 235-53.

Zolli, Eugenio. "Nazarenus Vocabitur," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIX (1958), 135-36.

BIOGRAPHY

The son of Walter Barnes and Zelle Daly Tatum, Walter Barnes Tatum, Jr. was born in Mobile, Alabama, on April 24, 1938. Included in the family circle was one younger sister, Karla.

He attended the Mobile Public Schools and graduated from Murphy High in 1956. A 1960 graduate of Birmingham-Southern College, he received the A.B. degree magna cum laude. As a Rotary Foundation Fellow for the 1960-61 academic year, he studied theology at St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, Scotland. He completed his professional theological education at the Duke Divinity School. That institution conferred the B.D. degree upon him in 1963. From 1963 through 1966 he attended the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Duke University. During this period, he was associated with the International Greek New Testament Project as a Graduate Research Assistant. He was appointed a University Fellow for the 1965-66 academic year. Among the honorary societies to which he belongs are Phi Beta Kappa and Omicron Delta Kappa. He is also a member of The Society of Biblical Literature.

An ordained minister of The Methodist Church, he served as pastor of the Acmar Charge, North Alabama Conference, from 1957 through 1960. While attending Duke Divinity School, he was the assistant minister of various Methodist Churches in the North Carolina and the Western Carolina Conferences.

He and his wife, the former Carolyn Delle Ferrell, were married in 1961.